Class 270 J Book P182.5
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

E. IV. e

THE

# CHURCHMAN ARMED.

CONTAINING

## PALMER'S ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,

AND

## BISHOP HOBART'S APOLOGY.

GEN. THEOL. SEMINARY
CHELSEA SQUARE
NEW YORK

NEW-YORK:
STANFORD & SWORDS,
No. 139 Broadway.

1844.

BR
146
P3
C4
1844

270 J
P/82.5

19928

GEN. THEO. SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

A

COMPENDIOUS

# ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,

FROM THE

## Earliest Period to the Present Time.

BY

THE REV. WILLIAM PALMER, M.A.

OF WORCESTER COLLEGE OXFORD, AUTHOR OF ORIGINES LITURGICÆ, &C. &C.

*WITH A PREFACE AND NOTES, BY AN* AMERICAN EDITOR.

FIFTH EDITION.

WITH A SERIES OF QUESTIONS, ADAPTING THE WORK FOR PAROCHIAL INSTRUCTION.

*NEW-YORK:*

STANFORD & SWORDS, 139 BROADWAY,

late

SWORDS, STANFORD & CO.

1844.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the Year 1841,
By SWORDS, STANFORD & CO.
In the Clerks office of the District Court of the Southern District of New York

Stereotyped by VINCENT L. DILL,
128 Fulton Street, New-York.

# PREFACE.

It is strange that a work like this should have been so long wanting in English literature. Rich as our language is in history, it possesses, as yet, no tolerable history of the Church of God. The scholar can in a degree make up this want by a resort to other sources: but those whose reading is confined to their native language, and those whose little leisure affords no time for research, or the study of bulky works, have had nothing really worth attention, on this subject, within their reach.

Dry abridgments or still drier compends, crowding the memory with names and dates, and little else, are not what is needed for general information on the most interesting of all topics that can occupy the attention of a thinking man——the rise and progress of the society of which God is the Head, souls bought and washed with the most precious blood of Christ the members, and eternity the exclusive end and aim. The existence of such a society among men, its continuance,

its propagation, and its more or less visible success, are *facts*, that taken in connection with its *claims*, have a direct and fearfully important interest for every member of the human family. It is with reference to that interest that they ought to be treated, at least for popular use. Catalogues of heresies, maps of the extension and contraction of Christendom in successive ages, and schemes of controversies that have raged and waned, all useful in their way, are of little use to the man who is seeking after evidence of the accomplishment of the ends for which the SON of GOD assumed our nature, and when He had ascended to the right hand of the Majesty on high, sent forth the promise of His Father upon those whom He had sent into the world as He Himself was sent. The effectual working of Him who, in the fulness of the power and wisdom of the Godhead, dwells invisibly in the visible body that he organised and animates, is not to be learned from the weary and disgustful annals of contests between rival hierarchies, and intrigues of ecclesiastics with or against the civil power; still less from the revolting exhibition of human frailty and perversity contaminating the provisions of infinite Love and Wisdom, an exhibition necessarily prominent in the chronicles of the Church, but most unnecessary to any true and adequate estimate of its real efficiency. All analogy and all experience bid us look for that efficiency in unobtrusive quietness and seclusion. "The works of the flesh are manifest," and accordingly attract, wherever sinful man works out the designs of GOD, the superficial observer's gaze. "The fruits of the Spirit," meanwhile, which are the tests of the fulfilment of the Saviour's promise to be ever with His body, lie hidden beneath the surface of society, and must be diligently

sought for, and painfully dragged forth to view, before their evidence can be appreciated. The many whom the means of God's providing have silently nurtured up in faith and holiness have passed to their reward without leaving a trace behind on the page of history. The few who stand there recorded as exceptions from the mass of brawling strife and base ambition have been drawn from among their fellows by the demands of duty, growing out of official station or extraordinary endowments. Such must always be the minority in the records of the Church; and it is as strange as lamentable that most of its historians seem to have lost sight of a truth so obvious, and while they either gloat or rave on the corruption of the clergy and the vile degeneracy of the laity, forget that a similar mode of estimation would go far toward the reduction of the past to one vast blot, and the banishment of virtue, peace and happiness from memory or belief.

This work has been prepared on a different plan. Its truly learned and sound-minded author has set himself honestly to seek out the results of the system devised by heavenly Wisdom and set in operation by God Himself, when He dwelt among us. He does not puzzle himself and his reader with an attempt at a "pragmatical"* investigation of the human motives and propensities that have carried on, while they seemed to thwart and vitiate, the divine counsels for man's salvation. Still less does he stoop to flatter the poor pride of human reason by lowering a narrative of God's doings with and in His Church to the tone of secular history, and making all plain and easy for the most unspiritual comprehension. He writes as a believer of the facts that he narrates; but not a believer without

* See Mosheim's Preface.

investigation. He writes as one whose own belief makes him in earnest with his reader, and in consequence leaves the impression of *reality* on the mind. Convinced that God did indeed found His Church upon a rock, immoveable and unconquerable, he looks for it, without fear or shrinking, amid the worst tempests of controversial strife or secular oppression, and under the deepest mists of ignorance and error, and not only finds it, signalized by its unvarying tokens of peace, holiness and joy, but makes it obvious to others. We see, with him, that though times have changed, and manners varied, the word and promises of God have endured unchanged and their accomplishment has gone on invariably.

In this respect, Mr. Palmer's design is the same with that of the pious Milner. But, beside its greater compendiousness, so much better suited for popular use, this work has the advantage of much better execution. The decided bias which so often sways the judgment of Milner is no where discoverable in Mr. Palmer. The scriptural catalogue of "fruits of the Spirit" is his test of that Spirit's presence, not any human scheme of doctrine. The bond of union by which he traces Christian faith and holiness up to their source in Christ, is the real and tangible bond of ordinances and institutions, not the figmentary connection of agreement in certain arbitrary views. He is content to find the fulfilment of the promise wherever it pleased the Giver to impart it, without questioning His ability or disposition to raise up burning and shining lights even in the midst of darkness, and perpetuate vital heat even in a body sorely diseased and maimed.

A great degree of accuracy in general outline, and in minute detail wherever that is given, is another admira-

ble characteristic of Mr. Palmer's work. It has been increased, perhaps, by the correction of one or two slips of a hasty pen, in this edition; and the minute differences, of statement or opinion, in some of the editor's additional notes, will show how thoroughly he shared in the author's anxiety to be really useful—an end to be attained, in a work like this, only by the most scrupulous adherence to truth. If error as to fact be found in the book now presented to the reader, it has escaped not only the attention of the learned and indefatigable author, but the close examination of his humble and grateful fellow labourer,

W. R. W.

*Baltimore, December* 11*th*, 1840.

# CONTENTS.


Page.

CHAPTER I.

Introduction - - - - - - - - - - - - 1

CHAPTER II.

On the early Progress of Christianity, A.D. 30-320. - - - 5

CHAPTER III.

Faith of the Church, A.D. 30-320. - - - - - - - 10

CHAPTER IV.

Fruits of Faith, exemplified in the Martyrs, A.D. 30-320. - - 13

CHAPTER V.

Fruits of Faith, exemplified in the Lives of Christians, A.D. 30-320. 21

CHAPTER VI.

Communion, Rites, and Discipline, A.D. 30-320. - - - - - 24

CHAPTER VII.

Faith of the Church defended by the six œcumenical Synods, A.D. 320-680. - - - - - - - - - - - - 34

CHAPTER VIII.

Fruits of Faith, exemplified in the Saints and Martyrs, A.D. 320-680. 48

CHAPTER IX.

Unity and Discipline of the Church, A.D. 320-680. - - - - - 63

CHAPTER X.

Rise of Abuses and Corruptions, A.D. 320-680. - - - - - 68

CHAPTER XI.

Progress of Christianity, A.D. 680-1054. - - - - - - - 74

CHAPTER XII

Faith of the Church, A.D. 680-1054. - - - - - - 77

CHAPTER XIII.

Fruits of Faith, A.D. 680-1054. - - - - - - - - - - 83

CHAPTER XIV.

Page.

Abuses and Superstitions, A.D. 680-1054. - - - - - - - 100

CHAPTER XV.

Divisions of the eastern and western Churches, A.D. 680-1054. - 104

CHAPTER XVI.

Progress of Christianity, A.D. 1054-1517. - - - - - - 106

CHAPTER XVII.

Faith of the Church, A.D. 1054-1517. - - - - - - - 113

CHAPTER XVIII.

Fruits of Faith, A.D. 1054-1517. - - - - - - - - 117

CHAPTER XIX.

The eastern Church, A.D. 1054-1517. - - - - - - - 129

CHAPTER XX.

Abuses and Corruptions, A.D. 1054-1517. - - - - - - 132

CHAPTER XXI.

The foreign Reformation, A.D. 1517-1839. - - - - - 146

CHAPTER XXII.

The British Churches, A.D. 1530-1839. - - - - - - 157

CHAPTER XXIII.

Fruits of Faith in the British Churches, A.D. 1530-1839. - - - 172

CHAPTER XXIV.

The Roman Churches, A.D. 1517-1839. - - - - - - 195

CHAPTER XXV.

Fruits of Faith in the Roman Churches, A.D. 1530-1660. - - - 202

CHAPTER XXVI.

The oriental Churches, A.D. 1517-1839. - - - - - - 216

CHAPTER XXVII.

The Rise and Progress of Infidelity. - - - - - - 218

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Conclusion. - - - - - - - - - - - - 225

---

Index. - - - - - - - - - - - - - 229

Explanation of difficult Words. - - - - - - 233

A COMPENDIOUS

# Ecclesiastical History.

## CHAPTER I.

### INTRODUCTION.

The history of the world impresses the reflecting mind with the universal tendency of human institutions to decay and dissolution. Whether we contemplate the fate of man himself, or of illustrious empires raised by virtue, cemented by wisdom, but destroyed by luxury and sin, we trace in all the operation of that sentence of death which once passed on all men, and to which all that is merely human must bow.

But in the history of the Church we view not only the working of the law of death, but the counteracting tendency of the Spirit of life, sustaining man amidst his infirmities, elevating him above all that is carnal and terrestrial, and impressing on his actions and his destinies the stamp of eternity. Empires, superstitions, and philosophies, have faded away, but true religion continues always to exist; and as it came in the beginning from above, so at the end of all things it shall return thither again. The patriarchs and the prophets, the law and the gospel, preached to mankind the same religion, which was expanded and developed as the fullness of time drew on. We now behold the fulfilment of what the patriarchs desired to see; we enjoy the reality of those things which the law of Moses foreshadowed; we worship the God of Abel and of Abraham, and serve him with their faith.

And as the true religion has always been essentially the same, so has it ever had to contend with the same inclination of the human heart. That inclination was awfully exemplified in the days of Noah, when "all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth;" and that patriarch's family were alone found just. It was still more wonderfully manifested in the rebellions and backslidings of the children of Israel. It is again seen in the description which Scripture gives of the fallen state of Jew and Gentile, when the Son of God came to save a perishing world.[1] And who, that reflects on the exhortations and predictions addressed to Christians by the Lord and his disciples, can fail to perceive that the same evil tendency of the human heart was always to remain, even in the state of grace, and to form the chief danger and trial of the Church of God?

The life of a true Christian, as described in Scripture, consists of self-denial, of warfare against the inclinations of nature, of prayer and watchfulness under the deepest consciousness of infirmity, of labour to walk under the guidance of the Spirit of God, with objects, tastes, and desires, altogether different from those of the natural man. It was the sovereign will of God, that those who are saved should be fitted for their glorious inheritance by the discipline of this rough and narrow way; but few, even of the best men, have passed through it without many grievous failures: all have come short of the glory of God, and all have need of serious and frequent repentance. Many, who profess to be disciples, have altogether turned away to the broad and beaten track; and, as our Lord teaches that some should hear the word with joy, but in time of temptation should fall away; that others should permit it to be snatched from them by the assaults of the devil, or to be choked beneath the cares of this world and the deceitfulness of riches; he adds, that in that day many shall begin to say, "We have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou

[1] Rom. i. ii.

hast taught in our streets;" and that his reply shall be, "I know you not whence ye are: depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity."[1] The kingdom or Church of Christ is, indeed, compared to a field in which tares grow with the wheat,[2] and to a net which was let down into the sea, and gathered of all kinds both bad and good.[3] Such was to be the mingled state of the Christian Church, comprising not only evil men, but good men, subject to infirmities, errors, and sins.

Nor was the Church only to be tried by inward failings; it was to pass through the furnace of affliction and persecution from without. The saints in heaven are described as "they that came out of great tribulation;"[4] and as the Captain of our salvation was made perfect through sufferings,[5] so it was fitting that the Church, which is His Body,[6] should be baptized with the baptism of his afflictions; and accordingly his promise was, "In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world."[7]

There was still a subtler danger in store for the Church, connected indeed with the desires of the natural man, but raised and stimulated by the Author of evil. False Christs and false prophets were to arise, and to show great signs; insomuch that, if it were possible, they should deceive the very elect.[8] Damnable heresies were to be secretly introduced:[9] false teachers and antichrists, carried away by the desire of a godless pre-eminence, were to subvert the faith of the unstable.[10] As the apostle said, "There must be heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you."[11]

Such were to be the infirmities, such the dangers of the Church; and had she been left alone, and unaided amidst them all, "the waters had overwhelmed her, the stream had

[1] Luke xiii. 26, 27. [2] Matt. xiii. 24-30, 37-43. [3] Matt. xiii. 47-50
[4] Rev. vii. 14. [5] Heb. ii. 10. [6] Col. i. 24.
[7] John xvi. 33. [8] Matt. xxiii. 24. [9] 2 Pet. ii. 1.
[10] Acts, xx. 30; 1 Tim. iv. 1; 2 Tim. iii; 1 John ii. 18, iv. 3.
[11] 1 Cor. xi. 19.

gone over her soul."[1] Nothing but the Spirit of God within her could have saved her from speedy destruction. But it had been decreed of old, that in the seed of Abraham "all the nations of the earth should be blessed."[2] It had been foretold by the Spirit, that He "should be for salvation to the end of the earth;"[3] that He "should have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth."[4] It had been declared that his kingdom should endure "for ever,"[5] and that "of the increase of his goverment and peace there should be no end."[6] And therefore when the Son of God came into the world, he said unto his disciples, "On this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it:"[7] and therefore did he console them in the prospect of his departure; "I will not leave you comfortless, I will come unto you:"[8] "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth."[9] And when about to ascend up on high, he left to them that encouraging and blessed promise, "Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world."[10]

The history of the Church, then, is not like other histories, in which the progress and fate of human enterprises is described; it is the fulfilment of God's will for the salvation of man, the accomplishment of prophecies, the triumph of grace over the imperfection and sins of nature. The perpetuity of the Church; its propagation in all nations; the succession of the true faith; the manifestations of the Holy Spirit's assistance in the lives of Christians; the calamities, errors, afflictions, which, in all ages, beset it,—afford new proofs of the truth of Christianity itself, and inspire the devout mind with humility and faith.

The principal periods of ecclesiastical history may be arranged under the following divisions.

[1] Ps. cxxiv. 4. [2] Gen. xxii. 18. [3] Is. xlix. 6.
[4] Ps. lxxii. 8. [5] Daniel ii. 44. [6] Isaiah ix. 7.
[7] Matt. xvi. 18. [8] John xiv. 18. [9] John xiv. 16.
[10] Matt. xxviii. 20.

First, the ages of persecution, which terminated with the accession of the Emperor Constantine to universal empire, in A. D. 320, and during which the Church was purest.

Secondly, the ages, (A.D. 320-680,) when heresies invaded the Church, and were repelled by the six holy œcumenical synods; and when the ravages of barbarians and heathens were counterbalanced by the conversion of many nations.

Thirdly, the period (680-1054) in which ignorance, worldliness, and superstition, began to fall thickly upon the Church, though an earnest spirit of piety still continued to produce evangelists, saints, and martyrs, and to add wide regions to the Church of Christ.

Fourthly, the times (1054-1517) when the East and West were estranged by the ambition of the Roman pontiffs; when those bishops, elevated to the summit of temporal and spiritual power in the West, introduced numberless corruptions and innovations; and when their power began to fade away.

Fifthly, the epoch (1517-1839) when a reformation being called for, was resisted by those who ought to have promoted it; when the Western Church became divided; and at length infidelity came to threaten universal destruction.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### ON THE EARLY PROGRESS OF CHRISTIANITY.

### A.D. 30-320.

"WHEREUNTO shall we liken the kingdom of God, or with what comparison shall we compare it?" said the Lord. "It is like a grain of mustard-seed, which, when it is sown in the earth, is less than all the seeds that be in the earth. But when it is sown, it groweth up, and becometh greater than all herbs, and shooteth out great branches, so that the fowls of the air may lodge under the shadow of it."[1] The Holy Spirit, by

[1] Matt. iv. 30-32.

the mouth of the prophet Daniel, had many ages before predicted the same wonderful origin and diffusion of the kingdom of Christ, under the figure of "the stone cut out of the mountain without hands," which "became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth."[1] Thus was Christianity destined to spring from a small and obscure beginning, and to overspread the earth in the luxuriance of its growth. And so it came to pass. From Judea, the least of the nations of the earth, and from twelve of its poorest and most illiterate children, a "sound went into all the earth, and words unto the ends of the world."[2] The Son of God, when about to depart, had given to them that lofty commission: "All power is given to me in heaven and on earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things that I have commanded you:" and they "went forth and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following."

The number of the disciples assembled in the upper room at Jerusalem, after our Lord's ascension, was only a hundred and twenty; but the miracles of the day of Pentecost, and the sermon of St. Peter, added three thousand souls; and ere long, "the Lord adding to the Church daily such as should be saved," the number of the men was five thousand.[3] In vain did the priests and their adherents endeavour to prevent the progress of true religion, by inflicting punishments on its preachers. The next account is, that "the word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests was obedient to the faith."

The Gospel was, as yet, preached at Jerusalem only—in one city of a remote and obscure province of the Roman empire. What mere worldly calculation could then have imagined the triumphs which were in store for it? Who

[1] Dan. ii. 35, 44, 45. [2] Rom. x. 18. [3] Acts ii. 47.

could then have expected that philosophies, idolatries, and superstitions, the growth of so many long ages, were to be prostrated and annihilated before it, and that the kingdoms of the earth were to bow beneath its dominion?

The destruction which Satan meditated against the Church in its infancy, was made the means of disseminating it more widely. The great persecution at Jerusalem, in which the first martyr, St. Stephen, afforded so noble an instance of the power of faith, dispersed abroad the disciples, who preached throughout Judæa, Samaria, Phœnicia, Cyprus, and Syria. The apostles alone remained at Jerusalem, where they probably continued to preach for several years after this time. Samaria, convinced by the miracles and the doctrine of Philip, with one accord embraced the Gospel: even the sorcerer Simon, deserted by his followers, and amazed at the gifts of the Holy Spirit, received baptism, in the vain hope of obtaining powers so far superior to his own. Tyre and Sidon now stretched forth their hands to the Lord; and at Antioch was a great multitude of believers. A.D. 37.

Thus was the first great impulse to the dissemination of Christianity given by the persecution at Jerusalem. The next arose from the preaching of the apostle Paul to the Gentiles, which commenced about fourteen years after our Lord's ascension. The result of his first mission with Barnabas was the establishment of Churches in Pamphylia, Pisidia, Lycaonia, and Cilicia, constituting the southern portion of Asia Minor. His next circuit, had the effect of extending the Church in Phrygia, Galatia, and Troas, or the centre of Asia Minor; and in Macedonia and Greece. Another journey added the coasts of Asia towards Greece; and the Church of Ephesus was formed, over which St. Paul presided for several years. Carried to Rome, he found Christianity already existing in several parts of Italy; and the Roman Church, which had lately been edified by his epistle, was now rapidly extended by his preaching. Released from prison A.D. 44. A.D. 49-52. about A.D. 59.

at Rome, he seems to have revisited Ephesus, where he left Timothy to exercise the episcopal office; to have preached in Crete, where Titus was invested with similar powers; and to have passed through Macedonia, and even into Spain; whence, returning to Rome, he suffered for Christ about A.D. 68.

The other apostles also preached the gospel among the heathen; though St. Paul declared that "he laboured more abundantly than they all." The north of Asia Minor, or Cappadocia, Pontus, and Bithynia, (addressed by St. Peter in his epistle,) probably received the Gospel from that apostle some time after A.D. 52; for St. Paul intended in that year to preach in Bithynia,[1] which he would not have done, had St. Peter already evangelised that province, as his rule was, never to build on another's foundation.[2] The date of St. Peter's epistle from Babylon suggests the probability of his having preached in Chaldæa; and St. Thaddæus is said to have taught at Edessa and in Mesopotamia. In Egypt the Church was founded by St. Mark, who constituted Anianus the first bishop of Alexandria. There are also traditions, that Persia, Arabia, and Ethiopia, were visited by some of the apostles.

Thus, in about thirty years, that little grain of mustard-seed had grown into a mighty tree, the roots of which had struck themselves deep in all parts of the civilised world; and already it extended "from the river (Euphrates) to the ends of the earth." Nor was the success of its propagation in each locality inferior to the wideness of its dissemination throughout the world. We have seen examples of its rapid increase at Jerusalem, at Samaria, and Antioch. The heathen historian Tacitus, in describing the persecution which Christians suffered at Rome in the time of Nero, says, "At first, those only were apprehended who confessed themselves of that sect; afterwards, a *vast multitude* discovered by them, all of whom were condemned." It appears from a letter of Pliny, the Roman governor of Pon-

A.D. 64-68.

[1] Acts xvi. 7. [2] Rom. xv. 20.

tus and Bithynia, that Christianity had nearly caused the heathen worship in those countries to be deserted. Consulting the Emperor Trajan as to the mode of dealing with Christians, he says, "Therefore, suspending all judicial proceedings, I have recourse to you for advice; for it has appeared to me a matter highly deserving consideration, especially upon account of the great numbers of persons who are in danger of suffering; for many of all ages, and every rank, of both sexes likewise, are accused, and will be accused. Nor has the contagion of this superstition seized cities only, but the lesser towns also, and the open country. Nevertheless it seems to me that it may be restrained and corrected. It is certain, that the (heathen) temples, which were almost forsaken, begin to be more frequented; and the sacred solemnities, after a long remission, are revived. Victims (for the sacrifices) likewise are every where bought up, whereas for some time there were few purchasers." It appears from this remarkable testimony, that Christianity had, in the course of about fifty years, almost subverted idolatry in those provinces. about A.D. 107.

Little is known of the progress of Christianity for some years after the death of the apostles. The Church was probably engaged chiefly in the labour of converting the population more immediately around it; and we hear little of new missions to the heathen; yet Justin Martyr wrote in his Apology, that "there is no race of men, whether barbarian or Greek, or by whatever other name they be designated, whether they wander in wagons, or dwell in tents, amongst whom prayers and thanksgivings are not offered to the Father and Creator of all, in the name of the crucified Jesus." We learn from Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, that the light of the Gospel had, at that time, been received in Germany, France, Spain, and in Libya: and Tertullian, a few years later, declares that Parthia, Media, Armenia, the Getuli and Moors in Africa, all the borders of about A.D 150. about A.D. 178. about A.D. 198.

Spain, many nations of Gaul, those parts of Britain which were inaccessible to the Romans, the Sarmatians, Dacians, Germans, Scythians, and other nations and islands innumerable, were then subject to the dominion of Christ. "We are but of yesterday," he said; "yet we have filled your empire, your cities, your islands, your castles, your corporate towns, your assemblies, your very camps, your tribes, your companies, your palace, your senate, your forum; your temples alone are left to you." "We constitute," he elsewhere says, "almost the majority in every town."

In the succeeding century new nations were gathered within the fold of Christ. The assiduous labours of Origen converted many of the Arabs to Christianity. The Goths of Mysia and Thrace followed their example; and a number of pious missionaries successfully disseminated the Gospel throughout Gaul, and founded several churches in Germany.

A.D. 214.

about A.D. 280.

So great was the progress of religion, notwithstanding the violent and cruel persecutions to which it was continually exposed, that it became no less the interest than the duty of the first Christian emperor, Constantine the Great, to relieve the Church from persecution, to act as the defender of its faith, and to distinguish its ministers and members by marks of his favour and generosity.

---

## CHAPTER III.

### ON THE FAITH OF THE CHURCH.

### A.D. 30-320.

THE promises of our Lord to his disciples, that the Spirit of truth should lead them into all truth and abide with them for ever, that the gates of hell should not prevail against his Church, and that he would himself be always with his disciples,—imply that the faith revealed by Jesus Christ should,

in every age, continue to purify and sanctify the hearts and lives of his real followers; and we may hence infer, that the belief which has, in *all ages*, been derived by the Church from holy Scripture; the great truths which Christians have always unanimously held to be essential to the Christian profession; which have supported them under the tortures of martyrdom, and transformed them from sin to righteousness; that such doctrines are, without doubt, the very same which God himself revealed for the salvation of man.

What, then, was the belief received by all Christians from the beginning? Let the martyr Irenæus, the friend of St. John's disciple Polycarp, reply: "The Church," he says, "though disseminated throughout the whole world, even unto the ends of the earth, hath received from the apostles the belief in one God, the Father Almighty, who made heaven and earth, and the seas and all that in them is; and in one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who was made man for our salvation; and in the Holy Spirit, who, through the prophets, announced the dispensations (of God,) the advent of the beloved Christ Jesus our Lord, his birth of a virgin, his suffering, resurrection from the dead, and bodily ascension into heaven, and his coming (again) from the heavens in the glory of the Father, to gather together all things in one, and to raise up all flesh of mankind, in order that, according to the invisible Father's will, every knee of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, may bow to Christ Jesus our Lord, our God, our Saviour, and our King, and every tongue confess unto him; and that he may exercise righteous judgment on all—may send spiritual wickedness, and the angels that transgressed and became apostate, and the impious, unrighteous, wicked, and blasphemous among men, into eternal fire; and bestow life and immortality and eternal glory on the righteous, the pious, and those who observe his commandments, and continue in his love, either from the beginning, or from the time of their repentance."

"This preaching, and this faith (as we have said,) the

Church, though disseminated throughout the whole world, guards as carefully as if she dwelt in one house; believes as if she had but one soul; and proclaims, teaches, and delivers, as if she possessed but one mouth."

Such was the universal belief of Christians in the second century, as it still continues in the nineteenth. We here find the most plain assertions of the Godhead of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; the incarnation and satisfaction of our Lord; the resurrection and future judgment; and the necessity of obedience and the love of God. That Christians worshipped our Lord Jesus Christ as God, is attested even by the heathen writer Pliny. "They affirmed," he says, "that the whole of their fault lay in this, that they were wont to meet together on a stated day, before it was light, and sing among themselves, alternately, a *hymn to Christ as God.*"

A.D. 107.

The condemnation of heresies in these ages affords an additional illustration of the belief of the Church. When Theodotus and Artemon, heretics, taught at Rome that our Lord Jesus Christ was not God, but a mere man, they were expelled from communion by Victor, bishop of Rome, and by the Roman Church; and they were universally rejected and abhorred by all Christians. When Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch, endeavoured to revive this error, a council or meeting of seventy bishops, from all parts of the East, assembled at Antioch, and expelled him from the Church. In their epistle, addressed to all the bishops, priests, and deacons, throughout the whole world, and still extant, they declared that "he refused to confess with them that the Son of God came down from heaven;" that he said, "that Jesus Christ is of the earth;" and that he had thus "abjured the faith, and gloried in the *accursed* heresy of Artemon." Nothing can more plainly show the belief of the Church. The error of Praxeas, Noëtus, and Sabellius, in the third century, who affirmed that the Father, the Son, and

A.D. 196.

A.D. 270.

A.D. 198-258.

the Holy Ghost, are but one person, thus virtually denying that the Son, or the Holy Ghost, could have been "sent" by the Father,[1] or "come from,"[2] or "be with,"[3] or "intercede with,"[4] the Father, were also universally rejected by the Church, as contrary to the Christian faith. The belief of Christians in the incarnation and real bodily existence of Jesus Christ was manifested in their opposition to the Gnostics and Manichæans, who held that our Lord's body was not real, but a mere phantom, and that he did not die on the cross: errors destructive at once of the truth of the Gospel history, of the atonement of Christ, and of the great miracle of his resurrection from the dead.

## CHAPTER IV.

### FRUITS OF FAITH EXEMPLIFIED IN THE MARTYRS. A.D. 30-320.

THIS may suffice to show the belief which was unanimously received by the primitive Church. Let us now proceed to observe its fruits. The power of true faith has never been more wonderfully exhibited than in the patience, the courage, and magnanimity of the martyrs. Animated by the promises of their Saviour, "whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my Father in heaven—he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it—rejoice and be exceeding glad, for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you,"—they believed, and triumphed in the belief, that their short affliction was to work for them a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.

But the afflictions which they suffered were enough to have broken down the strongest heart. Every thing that malice and ingenuity could devise was employed to shake their reso-

[1] John v. 23.
[2] John xv. 26, xvi. 28.
[3] John i. 1.
[4] Heb. vii. 25.

lution. The rage and insolence of a brutal populace, the scourges and tortures of legal barbarity, and the more subtle torment of promises and entreaties to save their lives by compliance in idolatrous rites, were the portion of innumerable disciples of Christ. The Jews had been the earliest enemies of the Christian faith; but their hatred was soon forgotten, in the persecutions which, for three centuries, were inflicted by the Roman emperors. To Nero, a tyrant whose name became proverbial, even with the heathen, for all that was abominable in impurity and fearful in cruelty, belongs the evil pre-eminence of being the first great persecutor of the Church. Accused by the popular rumour of having caused a dreadful fire, which had nearly consumed Rome, in order that he might have the honour of rebuilding it with greater magnificence, Nero expended large sums of money in conciliating the populace, in adorning the city, and in sacrifices to his gods. "But," adds the heathen historian Tacitus, "neither human assistance, nor the gifts of the emperor, nor the atonements offered to the gods, availed: the infamy of that horrible transaction still adhered to him. To repress, if possible, this common rumour, Nero procured others to be accused, and punished with exquisite tortures a race of men detested for their evil practices, who were commonly known by the name of Christians. The author of that sect was Christus, who, in the reign of Tiberius, was punished with death, as a criminal, by the procurator Pontius Pilate. But this pestilent superstition, though checked for a while, broke out afresh, not only in Judæa, where the evil first originated, but even in the city (Rome,) the common sink into which every thing filthy and abominable flows from all quarters of the world. At first, those only were apprehended who confessed themselves of that sect; afterwards, a vast multitude discovered by them; all of whom were condemned, not so much for the crime of burning the city, as for their enmity to mankind. Their executions were so contrived as to expose them to derision and contempt. Some were covered

A.D. 64-68.

over with the skins of wild beasts, that they might be torn to pieces by dogs; some were crucified; while others, having been daubed over with combustible materials, were set up as lights in the night-time, and thus burned to death. For these spectacles, Nero gave his own gardens; and at the same time exhibited there the diversions of the circus; sometimes standing in the crowd as a spectator, in the habit of a charioteer, and at other times driving a chariot himself: until at length these men, though really criminal, and deserving exemplary punishment, began to be commiserated as people who were destroyed, not out of regard to the public welfare, but only to gratify the cruelty of one man."

Such was the dreadful commencement of persecution; such the torments under which Christians steadfastly continued in their profession of Christ. The heathen regarded this steadfastness as obstinacy and insanity. The rejection of all the gods of the heathen, and all their worship, was stigmatised as atheism and impiety. Abstinence from the vices, the corruptions, and the vile pleasures of the world, was treated as the result of a sour and unsocial temper. But though "hated of all men" for the name of Christ, true religion only multiplied and increased under persecution. St. Paul was at this time beheaded at Rome, and St. Peter was crucified with his head downwards.

The next persecution was under Domitian, during which the apostle John was immersed in a cauldron of boiling oil, at Rome, and miraculously escaping without hurt, was banished to the isle of Patmos, where he beheld the visions of the Apocalypse; and from whence he went to Ephesus, and presided over the Churches of Asia. The reigns of Trajan, Aurelius, Severus, Decius, Valerian, Diocletian, and Maximian, were also stained by persecutions of the Christians. The last of these was also the most severe; it continued for ten successsive years, during which innumerable martyrs attested their belief in Jesus Christ. A.D. 93.

I shall select, as an illustration of the faith of Christians

under persecution, the following account of the martyrdom of St. Polycarp, who had been made bishop of Smyrna by the apostles, and was a disciple of St. John. The epistle of the Church of Smyrna, in which it occurs, and which was written A.D. 167,* commences as follows :—

"The Church of God which is at Smyrna, to that which is at Philomelium,† and to all the Churches of the Holy Catholic Church in all parts, mercy, peace, and love, be multiplied from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ." Having described the constancy of mind with which many of the martyrs in that city had borne the most dreadful tortures, they proceed thus :—"The admirable Polycarp, when he first heard of these things, remained undisturbed, preserving his calmness and serenity; and he had resolved to remain in the city, but being persuaded by the entreaties and prayers of his friends, he retired to a village not far off, where he continued with a few others, occupied day and night only in continual prayer, supplicating and beseeching peace for the Churches throughout the world; for this was his continual habit. And, as he was praying, he saw a vision, three days before he was taken; and behold the pillow under his head seemed to him on fire. Whereupon, turning to those who were with him, he said, prophetically, that he should be burnt alive." He was at length discovered by the persecutors. "Arriving in the evening, they found him resting in an upper chamber, whence he might have escaped with ease into another house, but he would not, saying, 'The will of the Lord be done;' and, having heard of their arrival, he went down and spoke to them with so joyful and mild a countenance, that they who knew him not before thought they beheld somewhat wonderful, when they saw his old age, and the gravity and constancy of his demeanour, and they mar-

*[Rather, as Mr. Greswell (*Suppl. Diss. on Harm. of Gosp.* Vol. IV.) has satisfactorily proved, A.D. 164.—AM. ED.]

†[Another copy has "at Philadelphia:" the epistle was no doubt a circular, addressed to several neighbouring or cognate Churches.—AM. ED.]

velled why such diligence was used to take an aged man like this. He immediately offered to them refreshment, and requested permission from them to pray in freedom for one hour; which being granted, he arose and prayed, being so full of the grace of God, that those who were present, and heard him pray, were amazed, and many of them repented that they had taken so venerable and holy a man.

"When he had ceased his prayer, in which he made mention of all whom he had ever known, whether small or great, eminent or obscure, and of all the Catholic Church throughout the world; the hour of departure being come, he was placed on an ass, and brought into the city, that being the great Sabbath. Here the Irenarch Herod, and his father Nicetas, met him, who placed him in their chariot; and seated beside him, persuaded him, saying, 'What is the harm to say, Lord Cæsar, and to sacrifice, and so to save your life?' And he at first answered them not; but when they continued, he said, 'I will not do what you counsel me.' Then having failed to persuade him, they uttered reproaches, and threw him violently down, so that in falling from the chariot he hurt his thigh-bone. Unmoved, as if he had not thus suffered, he went with alacrity and speed to the amphitheatre, whither he was led. And when the tumult there was so great that few could hear, a voice from heaven came to Polycarp, as he entered the amphitheatre, 'Be strong, and quit thee like a man, Polycarp.' No one beheld the speaker, but many of us heard the voice.

"When, therefore, he was brought forth, there was a great tumult among those who heard that he was taken. Moreover, the proconsul asked, as he approached, if 'he were Polycarp?' and when he had assented, he persuaded him to deny (Christ,) saying, 'Have pity on thine old age,' and such other things as are customary with them; as, 'Swear by the fortune of Cæsar; repent; say, Away with the godless!' (Christians.) Then Polycarp, looking constantly on all the crowd in the amphitheatre, stretching forth his hand toward

them, groaning, and looking up to heaven, said, 'Away with the godless!' But when the proconsul pressed him, and said, 'Swear, and I will release thee—reproach Christ;' Polycarp replied, 'Eighty and six years do I serve him, and never hath he injured me; and how can I blaspheme my King and my Saviour?' When the proconsul continued to urge him, saying, 'Swear by the fortune of Cæsar;' Polycarp saith, 'Since thou art so vainly urgent that I should swear by the fortune of Cæsar, and feignest not to know what I am, hear me declare it with boldness, I am a Christian. If thou desirest to hear the reasons for our faith, grant me a day, and hear them.' The proconsul said, 'Persuade the people.' Polycarp replied, 'Thee I have thought worthy to hear the reasons for our faith, for we are taught to render unto powers and authorities constituted of God the honour which is fitting, and which is not injurious to us; but for these (people,) I have not thought them worthy to hear my defence.' The proconsul said, 'I have wild beasts, and will cast thee unto them, except thou repentest.' He replied, 'Call them; I cannot change from good to evil; it is good to change from sin to righteousness.' The proconsul, 'I will cause thee to be devoured by fire, since thou despisest the beasts, unless thou repentest.' Polycarp, 'Thou threatenest fire which burneth but for a time and is then extinguished, for thou knowest not the fire of future judgment and of eternal punishment reserved for the wicked. But why tarriest thou? Bring what thou wilt.' Having said this, and much more, he was filled with courage and joy, and his countenance was full of grace; so that not only he failed not with terror at what was said unto him, but the proconsul was amazed, and sent his crier to proclaim thrice in the midst of the amphitheatre, 'Polycarp has confessed himself a Christian.'

"When this was proclaimed, all the crowd of Gentiles and Jews at Smyrna cried aloud, with irrepressible fury, 'This is the teacher of Asia, the father of the Christians, the destroyer of our gods, who teaches many not to sacrifice or to

worship.' Thus saying, they called out and requested the asiarch Philip to let loose a lion at Polycarp. He said that it was not lawful for him to do so, as the combats of beasts had closed. They then cried out with one accord that Polycarp should be burned alive."

The account proceeds: "These things were no sooner said than done, the crowd instantly collecting wood and combustibles from the workshops and baths; the Jews especially, as their manner is, lending their willing assistance. But when the fuel was ready, he laid aside his vesture, and loosing his zone, endeavoured to take off his under garments. This he had not been accustomed to do, as all the faithful contended who should first touch his skin; for always, even before his old age, he was universally reverenced for his virtue. The materials prepared for the fire were speedily placed around him, and when they would have nailed him to the stake, he said, 'Leave me thus; for He who hath given me power to endure the fire, will grant me also to remain steadfast without your nails;' and they did not do so, but bound him to it. And he, with his hands bound behind him, like a comely ram chosen from the flock to be a whole burnt-offering to God, said, 'Father of thy beloved and blessed Son Jesus Christ, through whom we have received the knowledge of thee; God of angels, and powers, and of all the creation, and of all the generation of the righteous who live in thy presence; I bless thee, because thou hast thought me worthy of this day and this hour, to take part in the number of thy martyrs, in the cup of Christ, to the resurrection of soul and body in the incorruption of the Holy Spirit, to eternal life. Amongst whom may I be received this day into thy presence as a rich and acceptable sacrifice, as thou hast before ordained and hast now fulfilled; thou, who art without falsehood, the true God. For this, and for all things I praise thee, I bless thee, I glorify thee; through the eternal High-priest Jesus Christ, thy beloved Son; through whom be glory

to thee with him, in the Holy Spirit, both now and unto all ages to come. Amen.'

"When he had uttered the amen, and finished his prayer, the executioners lighted the fire; but when a great flame burst forth, we, to whom it was permitted to behold, and who were retained that we might relate it to the rest, beheld a wondrous thing; for the fire, affording the appearance of a vault, like the sail of a ship filled with the wind, surrounded in a circle the body of the martyr; and he was in the midst, not like burning flesh, but like gold and silver in the furnace, and we smelt a savour sweet as incense or some other precious perfumes. The wicked, observing that his body could not be consumed by fire, commanded the executioner to approach and pierce him with a sword, which being done, a great quantity of blood came forth, insomuch that the fire was extinguished, and the crowd marvelled because the difference was so great between unbelievers and the elect, of whom, this our apostolic and prophetic teacher, the bishop of the Catholic Church in Smyrna, was the most admirable in these our times."

The narrative adds, that their enemies endeavoured to prevent the Christians from obtaining the remains of the martyr. They urged the proconsul that his body should not be given, "Lest, forsaking the crucified (Jesus,) they should begin to adore this man. And this they said by the suggestion and aid of the Jews, who had watched our endeavours to remove him from the fire, being ignorant that we can never forsake Christ, who suffered for the salvation of those who are saved out of all the world, nor adore any other. For him, as being the Son of God, we worship; but the martyrs, as being disciples and imitators of the Lord, we love as they deserve, on account of their unconquerable love to their King and Master."

Space will not permit me to cite similar examples of faith and Christian heroism from the martyrdoms of the blessed Simeon, bishop of Jerusalem; St. Ignatius, bishop of Antioch; Justin Martyr; the martyrs of Lyons; Perpetua and Felicitas; St. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage; and others innumerable.

## CHAPTER V

### FRUITS OF FAITH EXEMPLIFIED IN THE LIVES OF CHRISTIANS.

### A.D. 30-320.

In these ages the profession of Christianity was attended with such dangers, and involved so perfect a renunciation of this world, that worldly, sinful, insincere, and even irresolute men, were rarely found in the communion of the Church. The mass of Christians were thoroughly in earnest, full of zeal, and concentrating their hopes and their labours in the service of their Creator and Redeemer. If the Church in latter ages seem less pure and bright, it should be remembered that the world had then ceased to persecute; that it had even attached itself externally to religion; and thus, that a large number of professing Christians were not in reality followers of our Lord. For what the apostle says—"He is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart"[1]—may be applied equally to the case of Christians. The number of the real disciples of Christ, who constitute the soul of the Church, its vital and undying members, has perhaps not been less in later ages than in the times of persecution; but the number of false brethren, and the multitude of scandals, has been greatly increased.

The lives of Christians during the first three centuries exhibited striking evidence of the power of faith, and fulfilled the divine precept, "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." To the morality and virtue of their conduct, frequent appeal was made by the Christian apologists. "We," says Justin Martyr, "who formerly rejoiced in li-

[1] Rom. ii. 28, 29.

centiousness, now embrace discretion and chastity; we who resorted to magical arts, now devote ourselves to the unbegotten God, the God of goodness; we who set our affections on wealth and possessions, now bring to the common stock all our property, and share it with the indigent; we who, owing to diversity of customs, would not share the same hearth with a different race, now, since the appearance of Christ, live together, and pray for our enemies, and endeavour to persuade those who unjustly hate us, that by leading a life conformed to the excellent precepts of Christianity, they may be filled with the good hope of obtaining like happiness with ourselves from that God who is Lord above all things." There were many instances in those times of persons selling their goods, and giving them to the poor, though the practice was not general. It was customary for all Christians to receive the sacrament of the eucharist every Sunday; in some Churches, indeed, especially in time of persecution, it was administered every day; and it was considered a grievous offence to forsake the table of the Lord. The manners and duties of Christians are described by Tertullian in his argument that Christian women ought only to marry believers like themselves. A Christian marriage, he says, "is made by the Church, confirmed by the eucharist, sealed by the blessing, carried by angels to the heavenly Father, and ratified by him. Two believers bear the same yoke; they are but one flesh and one spirit; they pray together, kneel together, fast together, instruct and exhort each other. They are together in the Church, and at the table of God; in persecution and in consolation. They do not conceal their actions from each other, nor inconvenience each other. They may visit the sick, and be present at the sacrifice of prayer without inquietude. They sing psalms and hymns together, and excite one another to praise God."

Amongst the most illustrious saints and eminent men who adorned the Church in the first three centuries, we may name St. Ignatius, who had been constituted bishop of Antioch by

the apostles, and who, on his being carried to Rome, to suffer martyrdom, addressed many pious epistles to the Christian Churches, exhorting them to confess the true faith, and to remain united to their bishops, priests, and deacons; St. Justin Martyr who defended the Christian religion against infidels and Jews; St. Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, and disciple of the apostle John, whose martyrdom has been described above; St. Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, and disciple of Polycarp, who, having proved triumphantly against the Gnostics that there is but one true God, the Creator of the world, and that his Son, our Lord, was both God and man, was at last crowned with martyrdom;* the learned defenders of Christianity and moralists, Tertullian and Clement, presbyters of Carthage and Alexandria; Origen, the most learned writer of his time, a translator of the Bible and commentator; Narcissus and Gregory, bishops of Jerusalem and Cæsarea, who are said to have had the gift of miracles; St. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage and martyr, a man of ardent piety, zeal, and eloquence; St. Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, justly celebrated for his piety and wisdom, and an exile for the faith of Christ in the persecution of Decius.

A.D. 107. A.D. 150. A.D. 178.

We learn from Christian writers that miracles were occasionally performed in the second and third centuries for the conversion of the heathen, or to confirm the faith of Christians. St. John Chrysostom says that in his time (the end of the fourth century) they had ceased. It seems by no means improbable, however, that God may have permitted some signs to have been wrought in later ages for the conversion of unbelievers.

* [So some think, but without sufficient evidence.—Am. Ed.]

## CHAPTER VI.

### ON THE COMMUNION, RITES, AND DISCIPLINE OF THE CHURCH.

### A.D. 30-320.

No precept is more frequently inculcated in sacred Scripture than that of mutual love and charity between all Christians. "By this," said our Lord, "shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another."[1] By their relation to God as their heavenly Father, they are made brethren to one another; and therefore the apostolical command is, "Love as brethren." Such is the duty of Christians; they are bound to regard all their brethren as members of the same spiritual body as themselves; and hence results the obligation of holding communion in all possible respects with all members of the Church of Christ. Our Lord prayed that his disciples might be "one;" the apostles exhorted them to permit no schisms, no contentions among them,[2] and to avoid those who caused divisions,[3] whom they characterised as "sensual, not having the Spirit."[4]

This communion of all particular Churches with each other as parts and members of the one great spiritual body or society of believers, existed for some ages in much more perfection than it subsequently did, when earthly ambition and unchristian feelings were engendered by prosperity, and the tares began to grow thickly among the good wheat. In the time of the apostles it was manifested by the reception and admission to religious communion of Christians who came from other countries; by contributions for the relief of distressed believers in all parts; and by the exchange of letters and advice. The same practices continued for many ages to be general. Each bishop then could give to any member of

[1] John xiii. 3. [2] 1 Cor. i. 10-12.
[3] Rom. xvi. 17, 18. [4] Jude 19.

his Church who might visit foreign countries, commendatory letters, which, on being presented to the most remote Churches, secured his immediate admission to all the privileges of Christian fellowship, and, in case of necessity, to the kind offices of Christian benevolence. We have in the epistle of St. Clement, bishop of Rome, and the Roman Church, addressed to the Church of Corinth, before the end of the first century, on occasion of a schism in the latter Church, an instance of the same fraternal intercourse and solicitude; and in the following centuries, the epistles of Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, to many Churches in Pontus, Crete, &c., and that of the Council of Antioch, to all the Churches, are further examples of the same practice. We learn from Dionysius, that even in the second century, the Church of Rome was remarkable for the extent of its charities to the distressed and persecuted Christians at Corinth and in the East; and Dionysius of Alexandria, in the following century, attests that the same truly Christian conduct was still in full exercise, and that its benefits were felt even in the remote regions of Arabia.

about A.D. 165.

A.D. 270.

A.D. 247-265.

But, notwithstanding the obligation of Christians to cultivate brotherly love, the harmony of the Church has but too often been interrupted. Even in the time of St. Paul, the Church of Corinth was full of parties and division, as it afterwards was in the time of St. Clement. Paul and Barnabas themselves separated and departed asunder from each other. In the second century a serious division arose between the Roman and the Asiatic Churches; for when the latter persisted in retaining their ancient custom of celebrating Easter rather on the same day with the Jews, than with the rest of the Catholic Church, Victor, bishop of Rome proceeded to the extent of separating them from his communion; an act which was disapproved by St. Irenæus and the greater part of the Church.

A.D. 198.

A.D. 250. In the following century, a difference arose between Stephen, bishop of Rome, and the African Churches. The latter, headed by St. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, maintained that baptisms performed by sectarians and heretics were null and void, and that all converts to the Church ought to be baptised; while the Roman Church did not reiterate baptism when it had been administered by heretics with the proper external form, but received converts into the Church by the imposition of hands in confirmation. The practice of the African Church was approved by many of the Eastern and Egyptian Churches, and seems to have been supported by very strong reasoning; but Stephen insisted that the custom of the Roman Church should be adopted, and separated the African Churches, on their refusal, from his communion. This act, however, was not approved or recognised by the majority of bishops.

These dissensions between independent Churches were of a very different character from formal schisms. The former consisted in a temporary withdrawal of the usual marks of intercourse between different Churches; the latter were separations from the Church; the establishment of rival worship, rival ministers, different communions in the same place. In the one case charity was chilled; in the other it was entirely destroyed. Novatian, disappointed of the bishopric

A.D. 251. of Rome, rebelled against his bishop, Cornelius, and established a rival community at Rome, of which he was constituted the bishop; but when the case was known, he was condemned by the whole body of the Church throughout the world, and his sect was rejected as schismatical. In the following century, the bishops of Numidia, en-

A.D. 312. raged at the election of Cæcilianus to the see of Carthage in their absence, pretended that he had been ordained by apostates, and having ordained rival bishops at Carthage and elsewhere in Africa, separated from the communion of the universal Church (which supported Cæcilianus,) declaring it apostate. These sectarians, called

Donatists, were, after full examination of their cause by councils of bishops, and by the Emperor Constantine, universally rejected and condemned. They continued, however, for two or three centuries to disturb and persecute the Church in Africa. Separations like these, where rival worship was established, were in those ages regarded as most heinous sins, and destructive of salvation.

I now proceed to the consideration of the sacraments and rites of the Church. One of the fullest and most interesting details of the celebration of Baptism and the Lord's supper in those days which has been preserved, occurs in the writings of Justin Martyr. "We shall relate," he says, "the manner in which those who are renewed through Christ, dedicate themselves to God." "As many as are persuaded and believe what is taught and said by us (Christians,) and promise that they will live accordingly, are instructed with prayer and fasting to beseech from God the remission of their sins; we also fasting and praying along with them. Then we bring them to a place where there is water, and they are regenerated in the same mode of regeneration as that with which we were ourselves regenerated; for then they are washed in water, in the name of God the Father and Lord of all, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost; for Christ himself said, Except ye be regenerated, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven." This was the manner in which all converts from heathenism were admitted into the Christian Church, and made partakers of all its blessed promises and privileges. When infants were baptised, the parents or godfathers made the same engagements in their name. The practice of infant baptism was generally established before the time of Irenæus* and in that of Cyprian the question was only whether they ought to be baptised

A.D. 150.

A.D. 178.

A.D. 250.

*[Passages in the writings of Hermas (before A.D. 100;) of Justin Martyr (A.D. 150;) and of Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 200;) show that it must have prevailed, unquestioned, in their several ages.—AM. ED.]

before the eighth day after their birth. As infants had been admitted by circumcision into covenant with God under the older dispensation; and as our Lord had shown his favour to them by taking them in his arms, blessing them, and saying, that "of such is the kingdom of heaven;" and as it is related that the apostles baptised whole households of their converts—the Church always believed that the children of Christians ought not to be left in the condition of heathens, but received at once into the Christian body by holy baptism, and instructed to walk worthy of the high gifts which they had received.

The rite of Confirmation followed that of baptism. The apostles had laid their hands on those who were baptised, in order that they might receive additional gifts of the Holy Ghost; and we find from Tertullian that this custom was still observed by the bishops, the successors of the apostles, as it has always continued to be from that age to the present. Confirmation was generally administered soon after baptism; and it does not seem that for many centuries the discipline of the Church separated those rites by such an interval as is now customary; but it must be remembered, that in the first ages baptism was rarely administered except by the bishop, and at the great festivals of Easter and Pentecost, when numbers of converts from heathenism, who had been for months under catechetical instruction, and the children of Christians, were all together baptised with great solemnity, and immediately afterwards were confirmed.

A.D. 200.

"After baptism," says Justin Martyr, "we lead him (the convert) to the place where those who are called brethren are assembled, and prepared to offer earnest prayers both for themselves and for those who have been illuminated (baptised,) and for all other people every where, that they may be thought worthy to know the truth, and be found good men, and keepers of the commandments, that they may be saved with an eternal salvation. Having ceased from prayers, we

salute each other with a kiss. Then bread, and a cup of wine and water mixed, is brought to the president (bishop*) of the brethren, and he, taking them, offers praise and glory to the Father of all, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and maketh a very long thanksgiving, because He hath thought us worthy of these gifts; and when he has concluded the prayers and thanksgiving, all the people present approve it with acclamation, saying, Amen. Now 'amen' in the Hebrew tongue signifies 'so be it.'"

"When the president has offered thanksgiving, and all the people responded, those who are called deacons amongst us give to every one present a portion of the bread, and of the wine and water which has been blessed, and carry it to those who are not present. And this food we call the eucharist, of which no one is permitted to partake except he believes in the truth of our doctrine, and has been baptised in the laver for the remission of sins and regeneration, and lives so as Christ has taught: for we do not receive it as common bread or common drink; but as, by the word of God, our Saviour Jesus Christ was incarnate, and had flesh and blood for our salvation, so also we have been instructed, that the food, blessed by the word of prayer which is from him, through which our flesh and blood by a change are nourished, is (spiritually) the flesh and blood of that incarnate Jesus. For the apostles, in the commentaries written by them, which are called Gospels, have informed us that they were commanded to do so by Jesus, who took bread and gave thanks, and after giving thanks said, 'Do this in remembrance of me; this is my body;' and in the same manner took the cup, and having given thanks, said, 'This is my blood,' and distributed it to them only" (*i. e.* only to believers.)

"After this," he continues, "we always continually remind each other of these things; and the rich assist the poor, and we are continually with each other. In all our of-

* [Or 'officiating presbyter'.—Am. Ed.]

ferings, we bless the Creator of all things, through his Son Jesus Christ, and through the Holy Spirit. And on the day called Sunday, all who dwell in the city or the country assemble in one place, and the memorials of the apostles, and the writings of the prophets, are read as the time permits. Then, when the reader ceases, the president in a discourse exhorts and admonishes to the imitation of these excellent precepts. We then all rise together, and send up prayers; and, as we have said, when the prayers cease, bread is offered, and wine and water."

"But those who are wealthy and so disposed contribute each as he pleases; and the collection is deposited with the president, who assists the orphans and widows, and those who are in want, through sickness or some other cause, also those who are in prison, and guests who are foreigners; and, in short, he is the guardian of all who are in distress. And on the Sunday we all assemble together, because it is the first day, on which God, changing darkness and matter, created the world, and Jesus Christ our Saviour on the same day rose from the dead."

In those early times the creed was used, as it still is, as a confession of faith preparatory to receiving the sacrament of baptism. When the Ethiopian eunuch desired to be baptised, Philip said to him, "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." And he answered and said, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." Here is an instance of a creed, or profession of faith, even in the time of the apostles. Indeed, as our Lord had required faith in his doctrines, as well as baptism, in order to salvation, the Church was bound to ascertain as far as possible that those who desired baptism were believers, and therefore to require from them a profession of their faith. Creeds in this point of view, as summaries of the Gospel, are as old as the time of the apostles; their length and fulness varied in different Churches, and sometimes new articles were added, in order to assert the truth in opposition to prevalent heresies. The apostles' creed

was the ancient baptismal creed of the Roman and Italian Churches; the Nicene creed was founded on the ancient creeds of the Eastern Churches by the holy synod of 318 bishops at Nice, and was adopted as the rule of faith by the universal Church in all subsequent times. This creed was introduced into the liturgy or service of the eucharist in the fifth and sixth centuries. A.D 325.

What has been said of the apostolical antiquity of creeds applies also to liturgies. It appears that, in the fourth century, there were four forms of administering the eucharist in existence, which had continued in different parts of the universal Church from the remotest antiquity. These forms agreed in all their principal parts: their variety consisted chiefly in the different *order* in which those parts were arranged. One form prevailed in Judæa, Syria, Asia Minor, Macedonia, Greece; and, in the fifth century, was ascribed by the Church of Jerusalem to James the apostle. Another, which was established by St. Mark, prevailed in Egypt and Ethiopia. A third, which has been attributed, with some probability, to St. John the apostle, was used in Ephesus, and afterwards in France, Spain, and probably Britain. A fourth apostolical form existed in Rome, Italy, and Africa. Every Church had and exercised the power of improving its liturgy by the addition of new rites and prayers; but all adhered to the general order and substance delivered from the beginning. The liturgy or service for the holy communion now used in England,* resembles the ancient Gallican in the most essential points.

Penitence was regarded as the remedy for sin committed after baptism. It was generally taught that confession of secret sins to God, with a truly contrite heart and changed life, were sufficient to obtain remission of sins. In the case of sins, however, which were public and caused scandal, a dif-

* [And in the Protestant Episcopal Churches of Ireland, Scotland and America. The forms of the last two are more full and primitive than the English.—Am. Ed.]

ferent method was pursued. St. Paul had commanded the Corinthian Church to expel from its communion a person who had committed a grievous and scandalous sin, and had enjoined them to receive him again on his sincere repentance. The Church, acting on this principle, excommunicated any of its members who fell into grievous sin, unless they voluntarily submitted to a lengthened course of penitence. Penitence for seven, ten, fifteen, or even twenty years, was required for some sins, in proportion to their enormity or scandal. During this period, the penitent first stood outside the Church while divine service was proceeding; then, in process of time, was admitted into the Church, but obliged to assume the humblest attitude, and forbidden to partake of the eucharist. During all this time, he was obliged further to manifest his grief by fasting, weeping, mourning, wearing sack-cloth, and imploring the prayers of the brethren for his soul. Such was the severity of the ancient discipline; but the bishop had the power of diminishing the time, in cases where repentance was deep and manifest. The Church was at length fully satisfied, and the penitent was then solemnly absolved and blessed, and admitted to the full privileges of Christian fellowship. The same sort of penitence was required from those who had been excommunicated for their sins, and desired to return to the Church.

Those who committed great sins in secret were recommended to disclose their guilt to discreet and judicious ministers of God, and receive from them directions for the course of private penitence which they ought to pursue. In the latter part of the third century, a penitentiary was appointed in most churches, whose duty it was to hear such voluntary confessions, and to offer spiritual advice to penitents. About a century afterwards, this office was discontinued by Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople, on occasion of the scandal caused by an imprudent publication of a crime, through the indiscretion of the penitentiary of that Church; and from

this time, private penitents in the Eastern Churches approached the Lord's table at their own discretion.

The ministry of the Church instituted by the apostles consisted of bishops, priests, and deacons. The apostles retained the government of all Churches in their own hands at first, only appointing deacons and bishops, or presbyters (for these two names are indiscriminately used in holy Scripture;) but when about to depart from this world, they constituted bishops or chief presbyters "in their own place," as we learn from St. Irenæus. Thus Timothy was placed at Ephesus, Titus at Crete, Dionysius the Areopagite at Athens, Linus at Rome, Anianus at Alexandria, as James had been long before appointed bishop at Jerusalem. Even the opponents of episcopacy admit, that by the middle of the second century all Churches were governed by bishops; and, in fact, no instance of any Church not under episcopal superintendence has ever been pointed out in the course of fifteen centuries after Christ. Amongst Churches, some had pre-eminent distinction from their opulence and magnitude, or the civil distinctions which their cities enjoyed; and thus, in the second and third centuries, the Churches of the principal cities, such as Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Carthage, were much honoured. All bishops and Churches, however, were regarded as perfectly equal in the sight of God; and all regulated their own affairs, and exercised discipline with perfect freedom.

The rules for the appointment of bishops and clergy were various. In some Churches, the people united with the clergy in electing their bishop; in others, the clergy alone appointed him. Ordination followed, in which a priest received imposition of hands from one bishop, while a bishop was ordained by several. Each bishop was aided in his ministry by presbyters, or priests, and deacons, whom he generally consulted in important matters. The administration of the revenues of the Church was under his direction, and the deacons were his almoners.

Those who were departing from this life were strengthened by receiving the holy communion, which the great council of Nice commanded not to be refused to any Christian, who might desire it in his last hour.

A.D. 325.

---

## CHAPTER VII.

### THE FAITH OF THE CHURCH DEFENDED BY THE SIX ŒCUMENICAL SYNODS.

### A.D. 320-680.

We now enter on a new period of the Church's history, in which temptations of a different sort assailed her faith. The times of persecution for the name of Christ had now passed away; but the watchful enemy of man seized the moment when prosperity began to lull the Church into security, to introduce errors which were destructive of all true faith, and which led to persecutions, divisions, and innumerable calamities.

Religion had tasted the sweets of peace for a few years after the persecution of Diocletian had ceased, and her borders had been enlarged by the conversion of the king and people of Armenia by St. Gregory the illuminator, when the most formidable heresy by which she has ever been afflicted made its appearance. The evil doctrine of Arius, presbyter of Alexandria, disturbed the Christian world for fifty years. Several Roman emperors, deceived by the arts of one of the most crafty and unprincipled parties that ever existed, threw the whole weight of their authority into its scale; and sometimes it seemed for a moment triumphant. The doctrine of the Arians was, that our Lord Jesus Christ had been created, like all other things, by God; that he was not truly God, but a creature liable to fall into vice and sin; and that there was a time when he did not exist.

A.D. 319.

To terminate the disputes excited by these blasphemies, the FIRST ŒCUMENICAL SYNOD, consisting of three hundred and eighteen holy bishops, many of whom had been confessors and exiles in the time of heathen persecution, assembled at Nice, in Bithynia, by order of the Emperor Constantine the Great, when Arius was heard before all the bishops; and his doctrine having been fully examined and universally condemned as impious, he was driven from the communion of the Church: and the Christian faith was declared in that celebrated Nicene creed, which has ever since been received as the rule of faith by all Christian Churches. In this creed it was professed that Christ is "of the same substance" (homoüsion) with the Father, *i. e.* of the same *real Godhead*. A.D. 325.

This judgment was immediately approved and acted on by the whole Church dispersed throughout the world; and even the Arian party in the synod, not daring to utter any thing in opposition in the true faith, returned to their Churches acquiescing in the decree. Arius himself at last professed to believe in the Nicene faith; and it was not till A.D. 341, that the Arians ventured to compose a new creed. In the mean time, Eusebius of Nicomedia, and other leaders of the Arians, concealing their real sentiments, proceeded, by the aid of unjust accusations, false witnesses and violence, to depose and persecute the principal champions of orthodoxy. St. Athanasius, who, when a deacon at the synod of Nice, had distinguished himself in opposition to Arius, and who had been soon after ordained patriarch of Alexandria, became the chief object of their hostility. The Emperor Constantine, deceived by Eusebius of Nicomedia, required the re-admission of Arius to the communion of the Church at Alexandria; and, on the firm refusal of Athanasius, the Arians accused him to the emperor of causing division, and of other offences. Athanasius showed that his accusers were unworthy of belief. The Arians then excited the Meletians (another sect which had separated itself from

the Church) to charge him with imposing a tax in Egypt by his own authority; and, on the failure of this accusation, to allege that he had broken a sacred chalice, and put to death one of his clergy. But, on inquiry, this person was found to be still alive, having secreted himself in consequence of some offence which he had committed. The Emperor Constantine then wrote to Athanasius, expressing his approbation and confidence in him.

His enemies, however, were not discouraged. They at length prevailed on the emperor to assemble a synod at Tyre,
A.D. 334. where the Arian bishops alone were present: and when Athanasius had proved that the witnesses against him were unworthy of credit, and demanded time to bring additional proofs of his innocence, the Arians became so violent, that the imperial officers who were present privately removed him, lest his life should fall a sacrifice to their fury; and he was then condemned, and deprived of his bishopric in his absence. Athanasius besought the emperor to examine the case; and he accordingly wrote to the bishops of the synod, but was at last persuaded by Eusebius of Nicomedia to banish Athanasius to Treves, in Gaul. When Arius was about to be admitted to communion at Constantino-
A.D. 336. ple, by command of the emperor, he died in a sudden and terrible manner; and Constantine himself dying in 337, was succeeded by his sons.

Shortly after the death of the emperor, his son Constantine, who ruled in Gaul, permitted Athanasius to return to Alexandria, and wrote to the Church of that city, commending their bishop in the highest terms. But Athanasius was ere long again expelled by the Emperor Constantius, at the
A.D. 341. request of the Arian synod of Antioch; and Gregory, an Arian, was appointed bishop in his place. A large body of troops accompanied the intruding bishop to Alexandria, to secure his peaceful entrance into the city, and to expel Athanasius. That holy bishop feared lest the people should suffer on his account; but he commanded

divine service to be performed in the church that evening; and when the soldiers had entered the church to make him a prisoner, he commanded a psalm to be sung; and as the soldiers waited till the psalm was ended, Athanasius in the mean while escaped through the crowd of singers, and hid himself. For a long time he lived in a dark cavern of the earth, which had formerly been a reservoir for water. His habitation was known only to those with whom he dwelt, and to a maid who was thought worthy to minister to him; but she was tempted by the promises of the Arians, and Athanasius was about to fall into their hands, when God warned him of his danger, and he escaped. He then went to Rome, where he appealed to the bishop, Julius; and his cause having been examined in a synod at Rome, he was pronounced innocent, and acknowledged as the lawful bishop of Alexandria. This judgment was soon after renewed by the great synod of Sardica, which at the same time approved the Nicene faith, and condemned the Arian party, who had withdrawn from it on perceiving the sentiments of the majority. The cause of orthodoxy now obtained a temporary triumph. The Emperor Constans, who ruled in the West, threatened to declare war against Constantius, if Athanasius was not restored to his see; and accordingly that bishop, with several other of the persecuted orthodox bishops of the East, were restored to their flocks. Athanasius returned in triumph, with letters of the highest recommendation from Julius of Rome, from the Emperor Constantius, from Maximus of Jerusalem, and the bishops of Palestine. Even the Arian bishops Valens and Ursacius, who had been most active in procuring his condemnation, acknowledged that all their charges had been false, deplored their wickedness, and sought his communion. A.D. 347.

The eastern Church, however, was still troubled by the presence of Arian bishops, though many prelates, and the people generally, held the true faith. The western Church

was generally orthodox; and for some time after the synod of Sardica, the Western and Eastern Churches were separated from communion on account of St. Athanasius. The favourable prospects of true religion became speedily overclouded again. The Arians continued their machinations, under the authority of the Emperor Constantius; and, in 353 and 355, caused synods to be assembled at Arles and at Milan, in which, by force and fraud, the condemnation of St. Athanasius and other orthodox bishops was again obtained. The emperor had twice sent messengers to bring him to Milan; but the people of Alexandria would not permit him to leave the city, well knowing the dangers which awaited him there. Troops were then marched from Egypt and Libya to seize him; but when they had surrounded the church in which he was, he again disappeared; and was not to be found. An Arian, named George, was ordained bishop in his place.

It was at this time, perhaps, that St. Athanasius again had a remarkable escape from his enemies. While he was sailing up the Nile into the interior of Egypt, his persecutors, hearing of it, followed him; but he, being admonished of God, informed his companions of their danger, and commanded them to return to Alexandria. They accordingly turned about, and coming with the stream, passed the pursuing ship, arrived safe in the city, and remained unobserved in the crowd. On account of these wonderful escapes, he was accused by the Arians and Gentiles of practising magic.

When the great object of their dread had been thus removed, the Arians began more openly to attempt the destruction of the Nicene faith. They had already composed several creeds more or less unsound, and capable of Arian interpretations; but they now framed a new formula, in which the Divinity of Christ was apparently asserted strongly, while it really admitted of an interpretation favourable to Arian views; and having induced the emperor to assemble the bishops of the West, to the number of four hundred,

A.D. 359. at Ariminum, in Italy, they proposed it for their adoption. The synod, however, immediately required the Arian bishops to subscribe the Nicene creed, and deposed those who refused to do so; and it was only after they had been wearied out by a delay of many months, intimidated by the threats of the emperor, and solemnly assured by the Arians that they received the creed in the orthodox sense, that the bishops at last gave way, and, in hopes of securing peace, permitted the omission of the term *homoüsion* ("of the same substance,") which occurred in the Nicene creed. The majority of the bishops, too, either deceived or intimidated, subscribed the new creed; but the deception was soon discovered. The Arians proclaimed every where that the Nicene faith was condemned, and announced their own interpretation of the creed lately adopted. But though heresy seemed for a moment triumphant, it was soon to be overthrown. France and Italy, roused by the celebrated Hilary, bishop of Poictiers, who returned from his exile in the East, declared their adherence to the true faith, annulled the proceedings at Ariminum, expelled the Arians from communion, and transmitted their resolutions to the orthodox bishops of the East. Egypt was already proclaiming its agreement with their faith; for on the death of Constantius, Athanasius re-appeared suddenly in the church of Alexandria, after having entirely disappeared for seven years, during which he had dwelt among the monks in Upper Egypt. When he thus, beyond all expectation, appeared again, the people of Alexandria rejoiced with exceeding joy, and delivered all the churches to him, expelling the Arians. At the same time, Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari, and Eusebius of Vercellæ, returned from the Upper Thebais, where Constantius had condemned them to perpetual exile for their faith; and Eusebius was present in the synod of Alexandria, held by Athanasius to confirm the Nicene creed. When the emperor, Julian the Apostate,

A.D. 360.

A.D. 361.

A.D. 362.

heard that St. Athanasius was again in Alexandria, and that he was converting many of the heathen to Christianity, he commanded him to leave the city. When departing from his see, and beholding the people weeping around him, he said, "Take courage; this is but a little cloud, which shall quickly pass away." And so indeed it proved: for on the accession of Jovian, Athanasius was restored to his see, and testified to that orthodox emperor, that the true faith was then received in all the Churches of Spain, Britain, Gaul, Italy, Dalmatia, Dacia, Mysia, Macedonia, Greece, Africa, Sardinia, Cyprus, Crete, Pamphylia, Syria, Isauria, Egypt, Libya, Pontus, Cappadocia, and in all the East. Many councils of bishops successively confirmed the orthodox faith; and even those bishops of the East who were called Semi-Arians from their not adopting the word *homoüsion*, and who had been deceived by the real Arians, but whose faith differed not from that of the Catholic Church, now united in the universal acceptance of the Nicene faith. Thus the Arian heresy, when it seemed most prosperous, suddenly fell; and, after lingering for a time under the protection of the Emperor Valens, and afterwards amongst the barbarous nations beyond the Roman empire, it disappeared from the face of the earth.

A.D. 363.

A.D. 364-378.

The protection vouchsafed by God to the true faith was never more wonderfully exemplified than in the existence and final triumph of the Nicene creed. Craft and violence alike failed to overthrow the belief of the Church. The truth is, that this heresy had never been able to take deep root in the Church. Arian bishops in the East governed a people whose pious simplicity was unable to detect errors veiled under the guise of orthodox language: but when, at length, the real tenets of the Arians began to be more openly developed, and when the multiplication of creeds, and their internal divisions, had shown the uncertainty of their faith, and when the patronage of the state was withdrawn from their cause, they fell at once.

While the Arian impiety was falling, the enemy of man was engaged in drawing forth from it a new temptation for the faith of the Church. All Christians had hitherto believed that the Holy Ghost was truly the Spirit of God; but the Arian Macedonius taught that the Holy Ghost was merely a creature made by the Son, contrary to the words of Christ, who described him as the "Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father." This doctrine was condemned as anti-Christian by many councils in Europe and Asia, but especially by the council of one hundred and fifty bishops at Constantinople, assembled by the Emperor Theodosius, in A.D. 381, and which, having been ever since universally approved by the Church, has been termed THE SECOND ŒCUMENICAL SYNOD. On this occasion the Nicene creed was enlarged, in order to express the belief of Christians that the Holy Ghost is truly God.

The Macedonian heresy had not many adherents, and did not long continue to trouble the Church; but the disputatious and proud spirit of Arianism had engendered a brood of errors. Sabellianism re-appeared in the person of Photinus; while Apollinaris denied that our Lord possessed a human reasonable soul. These errors were universally condemned, and their authors were numbered with the heretics.

Though religion was suffering so grievously from the disturbances excited by heresies, it continued to expand itself among the heathen. Ethiopia was now converted by Frumentius, who was consecrated the first bishop of the Ethiopians by St. Athanasius. The natives of Georgia, or Iberia, and the Goths of Thrace, Mœsia, and Dacia, also received the light of the Gospel. St. Martin, bishop of Tours, completed the conversion of the Gauls, and is said to have had the gift of miracles. Thus did that grain of mustard-seed sown by Christ continue to increase.

The Church was now threatened with new afflictions and adversities, in the decay of the Roman empire. Attracted by the prospect of an easy spoil, the barbarian nations of the

Goths, Heruli, Vandals, Huns, Franks, Saxons, precipitated themselves successively on a luxurious and unwarlike population; and scenes of the most dreadful carnage and destruction overspread every province of the falling empire. The greatest portion of its possessions in the West became the prey of the invaders; and the Churches of Britain, Germany, Italy, Spain, and Africa, groaned beneath the yoke of heathen or Arian conquerors. In Africa, the Vandals, who were Arians, endeavoured to extirpate the true faith by most cruelly persecuting its defenders, and by prohibiting all ordinations to the sacred ministry. These savage invaders were gradually converted from their errors; but the destruction of learning which they caused exercised a permanently evil influence on Christianity. Ignorant themselves, and despising all literature, they were devoted only to war and to the chase; and even their conversion to Christianity effected no alteration in the national character and tastes. Hence education was despised, the most ordinary literary attainments neglected, and, as a sure result, superstitions were gradually introduced, and found too ready an acceptance.

While Christianity was suffering grievous afflictions and persecutions from the barbarians, the torch of discord was again lighted by the heretic Pelagius, at the end of the fourth century. Pelagius denied that human nature is inclined to evil, or that man needs the assistance of divine grace to lead and assist him to perform good works. This doctrine was most strenuously opposed by the illustrious St. Augustine, bishop of Hippo in Africa, and was condemned by many councils in the East and West, especially by a council of two hundred bishops at Carthage, the decrees of which were generally approved by the Church. This council excommunicated all those who taught that Adam was naturally mortal, so that death was not the punishment of sin; or that it is unnecessary to baptise infants; or that they do not derive from Adam any original sin which needs to be expiated by regeneration; or that the words of St. John,

A.D. 417.

"If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves," are merely to be understood as an expression of humility, not as the declaration of a real fact: for, as the decree adds, "the following words of the apostle, 'But if we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness,' show sufficiently that they were not mere expressions of humility, but of truth." The heresy of Pelagius was finally condemned in the third œcumenical synod, of which I am about to speak.

Nestorius, a vain and arrogant man,* being ordained to the patriarchal see of Constantinople, declaimed violently against the title of Theotokos, applied by ancient piety to the Virgin Mary, signifying that she was the mother of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ,—and taught that God the Word and the man Christ Jesus were different persons under the same appearance. This was contrary to the Scripture, which said that "the Word was made flesh," and that God "purchased the Church with his own blood;" implying evidently that *one* and the same person, who was both God and man, had died for the sins of the world. A council of two hundred bishops at Ephesus, and which the Church reckons as the THIRD ŒCUMENICAL SYNOD, A.D. 431. condemned the errors of Nestorius; and the decision, though disputed for a short time by the bishops of Syria under some feelings of jealousy, was speedily adopted by the whole Christian world.† ST. CYRIL of Alexandria had the honour

* [Nestorius hardly has justice done him, by this statement. Fear of the Apollinarian heresy, and a predilection for the peculiar tenets and interpretations of the Antiochian school, made him over tenacious in opposition to phraseology adopted by the Alexandrian school: but the most accurate investigations leave little room for doubt that he did not teach the heretical doctrine afterwards put forth by some who took part in the dispute, and bore his name.—AM. ED.]

† [The "decision" of the Council was, more properly speaking, its *testimony* to the fact that the Church had always held the doctrine of the union of the Divine and human natures in the one person of the Lord Jesus. From this testimony the Bishops of Syria did not dissent. Their difference was

of being the principal opponent of this heresy.* The adherents of Nestorius, being banished from the Roman empire, obtained an establishment from the King of Persia, and have continued to exist as a distinct sect even to the present day.

In opposing the errors of Nestorius, some persons fell into the opposite error of confounding the divine and human natures of our Lord. Eutyches, an abbot at Constantinople, taught that in Jesus Christ was but *one nature*, compounded of the divine and human natures; so that, according to his doctrine, our Lord was not properly either God or man, but a sort of third being between the two, of a mixed and compounded nature. Deposed for this heresy by many bishops at Constantinople, he was irregularly restored by a synod at Ephesus, which under the direction of Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria, acted with the most savage violence against the defenders of orthodoxy. THE FOURTH ŒCUMENICAL SYNOD of Chalcedon, consisting of six hundred and thirty bishops, finally judged in this cause, and having condemned Dioscorus and Eutyches, established the true and sound doctrine of the Church, derived from holy Scripture, and taught by St. Leo, bishop of Rome, in his celebrated epistle,—*i. e.* that in our Lord Jesus Christ there are two perfect and distinct natures, the Godhead and manhood, united in one person, without mixture, change, or confusion. This doctrine was immediately approved and accepted by the great body of Christians throughout the world, and has so continued to the present day. The adherents of Dioscorus, called Monophysites (*i. e.* upholders of the *one nature*,) or Jacobites, abounded in Egypt and Syria, and their sect has survived in those countries till the present day.

A.D. 451.

The Church was consoled under these various afflictions

on the personal question, whether Nestorius and others did heretically depart from the doctrine of the Church.—AM. ED.]

* [But not without sullying himself by the use of very unbefitting means. —AM. ED.]

by the conversion of several heathen nations. The natives of Libanus and of a portion of Arabia were converted by the persuasions and authority of St. Simeon Stylites. The apostolical labours of ST. Patrick were rewarded by the conversion of the Irish nation to Christianity. Palladius had been previously ordained to the same mission by Cœlestinus, bishop of Rome;* but dying soon, was succeeded by St. Patrick. The Gospel had indeed already some adherents in that country, but Christianity now A.D. 432. became general, and for the next four or five centuries learning and religion shed a bright lustre on that remote island, when barbarism and ignorance prevailed over the rest of Europe. The Church of Ireland during these ages remained independent, and was not subject to the papal jurisdiction. Clovis, king of the Franks, and founder of the French monarchy, received baptism, with many of his people, from Remigius, bishop of Rheims, A.D. 496.

The East still remained troubled by the remains of the Eutychian heresy, and the West was subject to the dominion of savage nations, who either rejected Christianity, or were imbued with the Arian heresy,—when a controversy arose in the East concerning certain writings of Theodorus, Ibas, and Theodoret, which supported the Nestorian heresy, and which were used by its adherents to promote their views. A council of one hundred and sixty bishops, assembled at Constantinople by the Emperor Justinian, and which the Church acknowledges as THE FIFTH ŒCUMENICAL A.D. 553. SYNOD, condemned these writings and various errors of the Nestorians, and approved all the doctrine of the four preceding œcumenical synods. This synod was thus a sort of supplement to the third œcumenical synod. It was immediately

* [This is extremely doubtful: or rather, almost certainly untrue. That both Palladius and Patrick preached in Ireland, early in the 5th century, is certain. That neither of them had any direct connexion with Rome, is in the highest degree probable. All else is inextricably involved in doubt.—AM. ED.]

received by the great body of the Church, though some bishops in Africa and Italy for a time did not acknowledge it; as they supposed, through mistake, that the writings of Theodore and Theodoret had been approved by the synod of Chalcedon.

Britain had now been for many years subject to the Saxons, who gradually subdued the Christian inhabitants, and formed settlements among them. These invaders, however, still remained in their heathenism, when ST. GREGORY the Great, bishop of Rome, commiserating their condition, sent ST. AUGUSTINE and other pious brethren to preach the Gospel in this country. Arriving about 590, he founded several Christian churches; but the conversion of the Saxons to the faith was chiefly due to several holy bishops and missionaries from Ireland in the following century. The ancient churches of the Britons which still continued, as well as the Irish churches, were not subject to the jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome; nor was the Anglo-Saxon Church for several centuries, though much reverence was felt for the ancient and celebrated Church of Rome, and much assistance derived from it in the earlier stages of their existence.

In the seventh century, a heresy began to be advocated, which, like the Eutychian, endangered the doctrine of the perfect divinity and perfect humanity of our Lord: for it was now asserted, that, after the incarnation, there was but one *will* in our Lord,—that of the incarnate God. But it is plain, that if we admit the doctrine of *two* perfect *natures*, each possessed of all its distinctive capacities and faculties, the doctrine of *two wills*, the divine and human, immediately follows. If this latter doctrine be denied, then the doctrine of two natures cannot be maintained; so that the Monothelites, who *did* deny that two wills perfectly united and harmonious, exist in our Lord, were only a branch of the Eutychians. After a struggle, which continued for more than half a century, the Monothelite heresy, and its supporters, Theodore of Pharan, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter of Con-

stantinople, Honorius, bishop of Rome, Cyrus of Alexandria, and others, were condemned in the SIXTH ŒCUMENICAL SYNOD of one hundred and seventy bishops, held at Constantinople by order of the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus in 680.

The circumstance of Honorius of Rome's condemnation for heresy by this synod, which has been clearly established by Bossuet, and many other of the most eminent Romish controversialists, affords an irresistible proof that the bishops of Rome were not infallible in faith, and that the universal Church has never acknowledged them to be so. It is also worthy of remark, that the sixth œcumenical synod was the last which could justly claim the title of universal, or pretend to represent the judgment of the whole Church. The succeeding synods, which are styled universal by Romanists, have never been acknowledged by the whole Eastern and Western Church, as the early synods were.[1] The seventh synod, as it is called, remained rejected by the Western Church up to the fourteenth century. The eighth and following synods have been always rejected by the Eastern Churches, even to the present day.

Whilst the Monothelite heresy was disturbing the Church, the false prophet Mahomet and his followers were conquering the Asiatic possessions of the eastern empire, and extending their triumphs through Egypt, and along the northern coast of Africa. In Egypt and the East the invaders were assisted by the Eutychian and Nestorian heretics, and their religion received a degree of favour which was denied to the Church. Persecution at length assailed the faith of Christians; and the result was, that in Africa, after four or five centuries, we hear no more of those five hundred episcopal sees which had formerly shed light on that region. In the East, Christianity slowly declined under oppression and persecution; but it was always

A.D. 612.

[1] See Palmer's Treatise on the Church, vol. ii. p. 200-249

preserved; and after the lapse of twelve nundred years, there are still many churches in Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, though they bear but a small proportion to the eight hundred episcopal churches which, in the fifth century, existed in those countries.

The decline of Christianity in the East and Africa was, however, very gradual, and the Church beheld the spread of the Gospel amongst many other nations. Christianity was now subduing the remnants of paganism in England, and exciting there and in Ireland a spirit of apostolical zeal, which disseminated the light of truth among many barbarous nations in the west of Europe. The Suevi, Boii, and Franks of Germany were converted by St. Columban, in the early part of the seventh century. St. Gall became the apostle of Switzerland; St. Kilian, of the eastern Franks; and St. Willibrord, and his companions, of Batavia, Friesland, and Westphalia. These holy missionaries were all natives of Ireland, except the last, who was an Anglo-Saxon.

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

### FRUITS OF FAITH EXEMPLIFIED IN THE SAINTS AND MARTYRS.

### A.D. 320-680.

We have now seen the promises of our Saviour verified in the continual existence of his true Church, amidst the terrors of persecution and the temptations of heresy. We have seen it expanding itself "from the river to the ends of the earth;" and though in some branches "minished and brought low," yet containing a principle of vitality which enabled it to repair its losses by new and vigorous shoots. We have seen those great truths which Scripture teaches unanimously and firmly maintained during this period. Let

us now contemplate the fruits which that faith continued to produce.

The holy men of this period may be divided into two classes: those who spent their time in a private religious life, and those who were engaged in the ministry of the Church. I shall mention some of the most remarkable men in each class successively.

Many of the most truly pious and holy men whom these ages produced, were among those who lived retired from the world, and who were engaged solely in the service of God. A life entirely devoted to religion, and separated from all domestic cares, pleasures, and occupations, had been the characteristic of the ascetics and sacred virgins* even from the time of the apostles; but the monastic or solitary life was first exhibited on a broad scale by Antony and his disciples in Egypt, at the latter end of the third and beginning of the fourth century.

In the present age it is, perhaps, difficult to appreciate justly the religious character of ascetic religion in the early Church. The monastic system of later ages, with its wealth, its indolence, the spirit of superstition or of worldly intrigue which have too frequently disgraced it, not to speak of still more unworthy and degrading faults, has but too justly excited the strongest feelings of disapprobation. But we should do an injustice to the Christian Church generally, if we imagined that such corruptions originally prevailed; or that the saints and martyrs lent their countenance to institutions, which were either in contradiction to the holy Scripture, or injurious to Christian piety, charity, and devotion.

The Christian who best knows his own heart will most deeply feel the continual tendency of the world, with all its busy thoughts and interests, to deaden his sense of religion, and to withdraw him from the love and service of his Crea-

* [These certainly did not exist as distinct classes before the end of the second century; nor even then, in any thing resembling the form of monkery.—Am. Ed.]

tor. He will feel that even the best and purest sympathies of life require the chastening influence of solemn recollections and self-denial, to prevent their becoming hindrances in the way of his salvation. Our Lord has said, "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not up his cross and followeth after me, is not worthy of me."

It was this that, in those early ages, led many earnest Christians, who felt their own infirmities, and sought for salvation, to relinquish the world, its wealth, its pleasures, its business and temptations, and to retire into quiet places, far from the noise of cities and the ordinary haunts of men, where the labour of their own hands procured for them the simplest food on which human life could be sustained, and garments proportioned at once to their poverty and the humility of their spirit. Thus having fulfilled the apostolic precept, to "work," and content with food and raiment, the simple objects to which Christ limited his disciples' earthly wishes, they devoted their lives to repentance, to rigorous self-examination, to prayer and psalmody, to the study of God's word, to the continual reception of the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, to works of charity towards the sick and afflicted; in a word, to all the parts of a life entirely religious, and to continual preparation for death. They literally followed the advice of our Lord to his disciples, "Sell that ye have, and give to the poor;" and after the example of our Lord and of his apostle St. Paul, and in accordance with their advice to those who were "able to bear it," they refrained from the permitted and honourable state of marriage, that they might "care for the things of the Lord; that they might be holy both in body and in spirit."[1] And who can be so cold and so uncharitable as to feel no sympathy with this holy zeal, this self-denying love of God?

[1] 1 Cor. vii. 34.

The contemplation of such instances of earnest religion ought rather to provoke us to a godly jealousy, to induce contrition for our own want of zeal, and to stimulate our faith. Those deeds of Christian devotion, the recital of which so deeply affected the eloquent and profound St. Augustine, and which were made the immediate instrument of his conversion, cannot be unworthy the attention of Christians in any age. It may not be difficult to point out instances of enthusiasm, of excessive mortifications, of superstition, and of errors, amongst some of the ancient solitaries; but it would be hard indeed to rival their religious zeal, their love of God, their ardent pursuit of salvation, and their resolution in casting aside every weight that could detain them in their Christian course.

ANTONY was born in Egypt, A.D. 251; and being left an orphan at an early age, he gave his paternal lands to the inhabitants of the place where he resided, and, having sold the rest of his possessions, he distributed them among the poor. Then associating himself with those who were zealous in religion, he emulated all their virtues, and finding a religious life delightful in practice, though difficult at the commencement, he continually devised new methods of devotion, self-denial, and temperance. His food was bread and salt, and water for drink; and he frequently remained fasting for two or three entire days. He sometimes passed the night without sleep, engaged in continual prayer, in which a large part of the night was always spent. His couch was a mat, or more commonly the bare ground. After fifteen years thus spent, he retired to a ruined castle in the desert, where he remained in perfect solitude for twenty years, and where his existence only was known by those of his friends who approached and heard him singing psalms. At length he was prevailed on to come forth from his retreat, and it was then seen that he was indeed a holy man. His soul was calm, unshaken by sadness or joy; he was neither troubled to see the multitudes who came to visit him, nor

pleased with their applause. He was exceedingly meek, most benevolent, agreeable, and inoffensive to those whom he met and conversed with, even though they should differ from him. The sanctity of his life influenced many persons to follow his example, and place themselves under his guidance, and thus the monastic institution commenced in Egypt. St. Antony died in 356, at the age of 105. Amongst other instructions, he advised those who were desirous of avoiding sin, to occupy themselves with some employment; "and let each of us," he said, "remark and write down the actions and movements of his soul, as if we ought to render an account of ourselves to each other. Be assured, that the shame of being *known*, will cause us to cease from sin, and from evil thoughts: our own writing will supply the place of our brethren's eyes." St. Antony is said to have cured many sick persons by his prayers. His humility and reverence for the clergy was very great. He was so humble, that he bowed himself before bishops and presbyters; and, when consulted by deacons, he gave them his advice, but did not offer prayer before them. He knew no other language but the Egyptian, and was not able to read; but, by continual attention, he had perfectly learned the Scriptures. He was never ashamed to learn,—listened to every one,—and if any person made a useful remark, he acknowledged his obligation. His countenance was so pure and calm, so undisturbed by any passion, and so full of a holy joy, that they who had never seen him were able immediately to distinguish him amongst many other brethren. St. Antony supported himself by the labour of his hands, and whatever he possessed beyond his immediate necessities he gave to the poor. He rarely left his retirement, except to plead the cause of those who were oppressed; for many persons brought their complaints to him, and urged his intercession in their favour with the magistrates. St. Athanasius was on terms of friendship with this venerable man; he induced him to come to Alexandria, for the purpose of declaring publicly his con-

demnation of the Arian heresy; a circumstance which was of very great service to the cause of orthodoxy. When about to depart from this life, he called his disciples, and said, "I enter, as it is written, the path of my fathers; for I see that the Lord calleth me." Then recommending them to abstain from all communion with the Arians, and not to permit his body to be carried into Egypt, lest it should be embalmed and preserved in houses, he continued, "Bury it yourselves, and cover it with earth, in some place known only to you. At the day of resurrection I shall receive it incorruptible from the hands of the Saviour. Farewell, my children. Antony departs, and is no more with you." Having thus spoken and embraced them, he died.

Next to Antony, the chief founders of monasteries in Egypt were Ammon and Pachomius. By the rule of the latter, his disciples were permitted to eat, drink, labour, and fast, as they pleased; but those who eat more abundantly were expected to perform more laborious works. On the first and last days of the week, all received the holy eucharist. They prayed twelve times in the day; and, when about to take food, they sang Psalms.

Ecclesiastical history has preserved several interesting anecdotes of these virtuous men. Pior was accustomed to take his food walking about; and when asked wherefore he did so, he said, "I wish not to regard my eating as a serious occupation, but as a superfluity." To another person, who made the same inquiry, he said, "It was in order that he might not be affected by any bodily enjoyment, even in eating." Pambos, not knowing letters, went to some one to be taught a psalm, but having heard the first verse of the thirty-ninth psalm ("I said, I will take heed unto my ways, that I offend not with my tongue,") he would not hear the second verse, but departed, saying, that this one verse was sufficient for him, if he could learn it practically. And when he who taught him the verse afterwards reproved him, because he had not for some months visited him, Pambos replied, that he

had not yet learned the verse practically: and many years after, being asked by an acquaintance whether he had yet learned that verse, "In nineteen years," he said, "I have scarcely learned to practice it." Pambos, by the invitation of St. Athanasius, came from the desert to Alexandria, and seeing there a public dancer, who was a sinner, he wept. When asked wherefore he wept, he said, "Two things have moved me; first, the end of that woman; the other, that I do not use such diligence to please God, as she does to please wicked men." Another brother, named Pitirus, was skilled in the physical sciences, and continually explained various scientific questions to those who met him, but with each of his explanations he offered up prayer. A certain disciple was informed of the death of his father, but he said to the messenger, "Cease to blaspheme, for my father is immortal." One of the brethren being possessed of nothing but the book of the Gospels, sold it, and gave the money to feed the poor, saying, "I have sold that same word, which saith, Sell all that ye have, and give to the poor."

about A.D. 320.

Hilarion was the great founder of the monastic state in Syria; and St. Basil carried this discipline into Pontus. It also spread rapidly in Persia, Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, and all the East. It was introduced at Milan by St. Ambrose; in Africa, by St. Augustine; in France, by St. Martin. The number of such religious men and virgins in the fourth and fifth centuries was exceedingly great. The spirit of earnest religion in those days very commonly took this form. The worship of God and self-discipline were not their only employments. Manual labour was strictly enforced, and all the offices of Christian charity were discharged. In particular, the instruction of the ignorant, and the conversion of the heathen, occupied their attention. Valentinus was at the head of a great congregation in Cœlesyria, where he, with many of his brethren, lived to a very old age; and "it appears to me," says an ancient historian, "that God prolonged the lives of these

men for the benefit of religion; for they brought over the Syrians in general, and many of the Saracens and Persians, from heathenism to Christianity."

The principles of self-denial received in the monastic fraternities, however laudable when taught and practised in moderation, were occasionally pushed to excess and error. Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste in Armenia, gave rules to the societies in that country; but he is said, through too great strictness, to have fallen into strange observances and practices, contrary to the laws of the Church. His disciples blamed marriage; refused to pray in the houses of married persons; despised the married clergy; fasted even on the Lord's day; held meetings for worship in private houses; and condemned those who eat flesh. For this reason, the neighbouring bishops assembled at Gangra, A.D. 370,* and declared them separated from the Catholic Church, unless they should forsake their errors.

An example of want of moderation in self-denial and mortifications is frequently pointed out in the case of St. Simeon Stylites, who lived in the fifty century. Yet it is impossible not to admit that, with some excesses in these respects, there was much to admire and venerate in his piety.† He was, at first, a monk in Syria, where he became so remarkable by his extreme austerity, that his superiors and companions judged it excessive, and he was obliged to leave the society. He then established himself as an anchorite, or perfect solitary, on a mountain near Antioch, where he is said to have fasted forty days and forty nights, and to have used a degree of mortification which some of the bishops

* [Others date this council A.D. 324; others 340; others 364: the second of these dates is probably the true one.—AM. ED.]

† [The "excesses" of Simeon were more reprehensible than mere "want of moderation in self-denial and mortifications." His multiplied bowings, protracted watchings, constrained postures, and pillar-isolation, belong to a low class of superstitions, and furnish a melancholy proof of the degenerating tendencies of his age.—AM. ED.]

blamed. But the fame of his sanctity spreading far and wide, he was followed by so great a multitude of people from Arabia, Persia, Armenia, and all the East and West, who came to him to see him and touch his garments, that, in order to avoid their importunity, he constructed a pillar, on the top of which he remained for many years, even till his death. He was engaged in perpetual prayer and fasting; he believed himself to be the last and lowest of men; was humble, obliging, and kind to all who approached him; and his exhortations were not unblessed by God, for he converted a great number of unbelieving Iberians, Armenians, Persians, and Arabians, who came to see him in troops of two or three hundred, or even a thousand, renounced their idols, received baptism, and learned Christianity from his mouth. Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, speaks of this as an eye-witness of the fact. His piety was held in much reverence by the king and queen of Persia, and by the emperors Theodosius and Marcian; the latter of whom went to visit him in disguise. St. Simeon was a firm and resolute defender of the orthodox faith against the Eutychian heresy, and died A.D. 461.

I now turn to the other class of holy men who adorned the Church in these ages. I have already spoken of St. Athanasius, the most renowned champion of the true faith against Arianism. He was supported by many holy confessors, especially by Hilary, bishop of Poictiers, in France, and Eusebius, of Vercellæ in Italy, who both suffered exile and bonds for their faith; as did Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari, who, however, afterwards showed an unreasonable degree of severity in refusing pardon to those who had fallen in the time of the Arian persecution; and even went so far as to separate from the communion of the Church, which generally adopted a milder course. The learned Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea, though at first connected with the Arian party, condemned their errors, and

A.D. 298-373.

A.D. 350.

A.D. 355.

A.D. 270-340.

collected the history of the Church. St. Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, and Meletius of Antioch, though ordained by the Arians, confessed and suffered for the true faith. A.D. 315-386.

St. Martin, bishop of Tours, was at first a soldier, and was so remarkable for his charity, that once, in the midst of winter, when the severity of the cold was so extreme that many persons died of it, having met a poor man at the gate of the city, and having nothing else to bestow, he divided his cloak with his sword, and gave half of it to the beggar. But the next night he saw in a dream his Saviour arrayed in the half of his garment, and surrounded by the angels; and he was so deeply impressed by his dream, that he gave up the military life and was baptised. When he was returning to his native land, he was taken prisoner by robbers in the Alps; but in the midst of the greatest dangers, he evinced such magnanimity, and so piously exhorted the lawless men by whom he was surrounded, that one of them believed, and besought Martin to pray for him, and afterwards became a religious man. In his own country, Illyria, he so strongly opposed the Arians, that he was beaten with rods, and compelled to escape. He then fled to the island of Gallinaria, on the coast of Italy, with a religious presbyter, where they lived for some time on herbs. He was a friend of St. Hilary of Poictiers; and passing into France, founded a monastery near Poictiers, but was afterwards made bishop of Tours by the unanimous choice of the people, though he was most reluctant to undertake the office. After his consecration, he still retained the same habits of life, the same humility of heart, and the same poverty of attire, which had always distinguished him; but to this was united all the authority and gravity of a bishop. He for some time lived in a little cell attached to the church; but being disturbed by the number of visitors, he founded a monastery two miles off, in a desert place, where he lived like all the other monks. A.D. 316-397. about A.D. 360.

The employment of the younger brethren in this society consisted in transcribing books; the elders were devoted only to prayer and meditation. St. Martin obtained so powerful an ascendency over the minds of the people, that he was enabled to overthrow the heathen temples, and build churches in their place. When he was invited by the Emperor Maximus to dine at his table, he refused, saying that he could not partake of the table of a man who had deprived one emperor of his throne, and another of his life. When the emperor excused himself, alleging that he had been compelled to receive the crown, and that he had not done so voluntarily, Martin accepted his invitation; but, to the surprise of every one, he gave the cup to his presbyter to drink before the emperor and his relatives. The empress, sitting at his feet, listened day and night to his discourses; and having obtained the emperor's permission to entertain him at her own house, she attended him at table, performed the humblest offices, and preserved the very crumbs which he had left as precious relics. St. Martin is said to have been enabled to work miracles for the conversion of the heathen.*

St. Basil of Cæsarea, and St. Gregory of Nazianzum, were united by intimate friendship in their youth, whilst they studied at Athens under the most celebrated teachers of the age; and when their studies were completed, Basil returned to Cæsarea, and from thence went to the monasteries of Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Syria, in order to see the religious life in its perfection, and to derive spiritual instruction from the pious men who dwelt there. Returning to Pontus, he retired to the desert to practice the religious life. Here he was soon joined by his friend Gregory Nazianzen; and they continued there for a long time, engaged in prayer, and the study of the holy Scripture, which they read with the assistance of ancient commentators, especially Origen.

* [Much that is told of him is of a very questionable character. Yet through all the difficulties that surround his history he appears plainly to be a great and holy man.—Am. Ed.]

They also laboured with their hands, carrying wood, cutting stones, planting and watering trees, and cultivating their garden. Nevertheless, they lived in the utmost poverty, and on the hardest fare. A great number of other persons imitated their example, amongst whom was Gregory, afterwards bishop of Nyssa, brother of Basil; and Basil gave rules for the monastic life, which are still followed by the monks of the order of St. Basil, in the eastern Church. About A.D. 362, Basil and Gregory Nazianzen were ordained priests, but still continued to reside in the desert till 370, when Basil came forth to assist Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea, against the heretics; and being skilled in the writings of Origen, he and Gregory confuted the Arians, who adduced those writings in proof of their errors: and though they, with their leader Eunomius, had been famed for learning, they appeared perfectly ignorant when they encountered these champions of the truth. Basil was soon after elected bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia; and fearing lest heresy should prevail in Pontus, he passed through the Churches, preaching the true faith, and confirming the wavering. When this came to the ears of the Arian Emperor Valens, he caused Basil to be brought before the tribunal of the Prefect Modestus; and when the latter demanded why he did not embrace the creed of the emperor, Basil boldly reproved the Arian heresy; and when the prefect threatened death, he replied, "Death will be a favour to me, since it will send me unto God, for whom I live, and whom I have long sought." The emperor was at last overcome by his firmness, and Basil was released. Gregory Nazianzen was, against his will, ordained bishop of Sasima by Basil. He continued, however, to govern the Church of Nazianzum during the lifetime of his father, who was the bishop of that see; and, like Basil, he went through the cities and strengthened those who were feeble in the faith. Afterwards he resided at Constantinople, where the Arians were in great force, and possessed the churches; and by his eloquence he raised the Church there to great prosperity. He

was at length installed bishop of Constantinople by the second œcumenical synod; but soon after resigned his see, in consequence of some divisions which had arisen, and retired to Cappadocia, where he died, at the age of more than ninety years. St. Basil had died in 379, reverenced by all the Christian world.

A.D. 391.

Amongst the most illustrious defenders of the true faith at this time was AMBROSE, archbishop of Milan. He had been made governor of that city by the Emperor Valentinian; when, the see becoming vacant by the death of an Arian bishop, and the people being violently disturbed as to the choice of a successor, Ambrose exhorted them to peace and concord, when all demanded at once that he should be their bishop. He in vain resisted, and attempted to fly. The emperor's commands arrived, and he was consecrated bishop. He sold all his goods and gave them to the poor, and applied with the utmost diligence to the study of holy Scripture. In order to redeem captives from the hands of the Goths, he even sold the plate of the church, merely reserving what was absolutely necessary. His firmness was soon evinced by his resistance to the will of the Empress Justina, mother of Valentinian, who prevailed on the emperor to demand one of the churches in Milan for the Arians. St. Ambrose firmly and successfully opposed this attempt, though at the peril of his life. The Emperor Theodosius having put to death a great multitude of people at Thessalonica, in consequence of a tumult having arisen, in which one of his officers was killed, Ambrose would not permit his entrance to the church until he had performed public penance, and made a law commanding all executions to be suspended for thirty days. St. Ambrose composed many eloquent and pious books, and died A.D. 397.

A.D. 374.

ST. JOHN, called CHRYSOSTOM (the golden-mouthed) for his eloquence, was originally at the bar; but forsaking the path of worldly honour, he retired from the world to devote himself to prayer and the study of Scripture; and after-

wards, being appointed presbyter of Antioch, he became the most celebrated preacher of his age, so that when the see of Constantinople was vacant, the Emperor Honorius sent for him, and caused him to be ordained bishop by a great synod of bishops. A.D 397. The sanctity and severity of doctrine and practice which had made him so remarkable at Antioch, led him to exercise a vigilant and unpopular strictness of discipline in the imperial city; and his zeal displayed itself further in visiting the neighbouring provinces and removing unworthy bishops. The people of Constantinople heard his sermons eagerly and insatiably, and the crowds were so great that their lives were endangered by the multitude, all endeavouring to press nearer to him, that they might hear more accurately, while he himself, sitting in the midst of the church, taught them from the desk of the reader. But the severity of his discipline, and his condemnation of vice, raised against him many enemies; and having taken the part of some monks who had been oppressed by Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, that prelate, availing himself of the assistance of the empress, whom Chrysostom had offended by a sermon, in which he spoke of women with but little respect, came to Constantinople and held a synod, in which Chrysostom was deposed by his enemies. But when the people heard it, they assembled in the church, required a larger synod to be held; resisted the imperial officers who were sent to take their bishop into exile; and when, at length, he was removed, they broke into insurrection, and surrounded the palace with cries and lamentations, demanding the recall of Chrysostom, which the emperor was obliged to grant. Restored to his see by a synod of sixty bishops, Chrysostom again, ere long, fell under the imperial displeasure in consequence of his objections to the erection of a statue of the Empress Eudoxia. He was then driven forth into exile in Armenia, where he died; and the eastern and western Churches were for some time divided on his account, as the former maintained the A.D. 407.

lawfulness of his expulsion, while the latter regarded him as a saint.

St. Jerome and St. Augustine, the most learned of all the fathers, now adorned the Church. The former spent the greater part of his life in the monastic state, in Palestine, and died in 420. St. Augustine was born in Africa, and in his early life fell into vices, and adopted the Manichæan heresy; but being at Milan, he became an attendant on the ministry of Ambrose, while his pious mother Monica prayed continually for his conversion. One day, a Christian, named Pontitian, coming to visit him, saw on his table the epistles of St. Paul, and learned, to his great joy, that Augustine devoted much of his time to the study of Scripture. The conversation gradually turned on the life of St. Antony and the Egyptian and eastern monks, of whom Augustine had never heard before. When Pontitian had described all their piety, and self-denial, and zeal, and also mentioned the effect which the recital had produced on two officers of the emperor at Treves, who, on hearing it had forsaken the world, and embraced a religious life, St. Augustine was deeply moved by the comparison of his own life and conduct with what he had heard, and went forth into the garden in the greatest agitation and compunction, where, having wept a long time, and prayed to God, he heard from a neighbouring house the voice of a child often repeating these words,—"Take—read;" and, regarding it as a sort of heavenly admonition, he returned to the house, and took up the epistles of St. Paul, when the first verse he read was, "Let us walk honestly, as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying. But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof." His mind was now completely changed: he received baptism from St. Ambrose, and returned to Africa, where he gave himself up to retirement, prayer, meditation, and the composition of books against

A.D. 387.

the Manichæan heresy. He sold all his possessions and gave them to the poor, and was made presbyter, and afterwards bishop of Hippo, where he lived in the monastic state. His life was devoted to the maintenance of the truth against heathens, heretics, and schismatics; and his various writings made him celebrated in all parts of the world. When seized with fever, and lying on his death-bed, this eminent saint caused the seven penitential psalms to be recited; and having desired them to be fixed up before him, he read them continually with many tears. He commanded that he should never be disturbed, and spent his whole remaining time in prayer, until at length he calmly and peacefully expired in the presence of all his friends, A.D. 430.

I have already spoken of ST. CYRIL of Alexandria, and ST. LEO the Great bishop of Rome, as the great opponents of the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies in the fifth century: both of these eminent prelates left many writings, which are still extant. ST. BENEDICT, a man of eminent piety and zeal, in 529 founded the monastery of Mount Casino, in Italy; and his rule was adopted, for many centuries, by all the monasteries in the western Church; but they very soon relaxed the strictness of its observance, and the conduct of the monks too frequently reflected disgrace on their profession.

---

## CHAPTER IX.

### UNITY AND DISCIPLINE OF THE CHURCH.

### A.D. 320-680.

AMONGST the Christian Churches throughout the world, the Church of the imperial city of Rome had obtained an early distinction. Seated in the capital of the world, abounding in wealth and in numbers, remarkable for a munificence

which was felt by the distressed and afflicted in all parts, endowed with a firmness of faith which opposed a steady and formidable resistance to every heresy, and founded by the holy apostles Peter and Paul, the Roman Church stood conspicuous amongst Christian communities; and, even in the third century, the neighbouring Churches in Italy, Sicily, and the adjoining islands, placed themselves under its jurisdiction. The first œcumenical synod of Nice approved of this jurisdiction, which constituted the patriarchate of Rome; but the bishop of Rome had no ordinary jurisdiction beyond his patriarchate. The appeals of St. Athanasius and the other orthodox bishops, when persecuted by the Arians, to Julius of Rome, and the support which they received from that bishop, led the great synod of Sardica to give the Roman bishop the power of ordering the causes of bishops to be re-heard in cases where it appeared to him they were unjustly condemned. This decree was indeed never received in the eastern or the African Church; and only, after the lapse of some centuries, in the western Church; but it laid a foundation, on which the Roman see began to build its pretensions. In the latter part of the fourth century, the spirit of encroachment began to work in that Church; its bishops now extended their jurisdiction beyond the ancient limits approved by the synod of Nice, and invested the bishop of Thessalonica with the title of "Vicar of the Apostolical See" in Illyricum, with the view of bringing, by this means, that province and Greece under their ecclesiastical sway. In the following century, the bishops of Arles and of Seville were declared vicars for Gaul and Spain: in the sixth, Augustine was made vicar for Britain. The principal bishops in each country were thus engaged in the interests of Rome, and were encouraged gradually to make inroads on the liberties of the Churches. These vicars were appointed chiefly under the pretence that the Roman bishop was bound by his station to see that the ancient discipline of the Church and the law of Christ were duly

A.D. 341.

observed; and this notion was confirmed, if not created, by the habit of many bishops in all parts of the world, of consulting the Roman Church on difficult cases of discipline, and frequently adopting its advice. It is true that they merely sought the *advice* of a Church of apostolical antiquity and of strict discipline; but that advice was often given in a tone of authority; and the decretal epistles of the popes, which we possess from the time of Siricius (the latter part of the fourth century,) formed gradually a body of precedents, which led the bishops of Rome and the western bishops to ascribe to the former a sort of legislative power in the Church, which was in the event productive of the most injurious consequences. But, during the period now before us, the authority of the Roman see, however encroaching, was almost always virtuously exercised; and if it excited somewhat of a spirit of ambition and encroachment on the part of other great sees, the evil was, in some degree, counterbalanced by the effective resistance which it was enabled to give to heresy, and to the ecclesiastical disorders and corruptions introduced by the invasions of the barbarous nations. Its efforts were chiefly limited to procure the observation of the canons or laws of discipline, made by the œcumenical synods; to encourage the spread of Christianity in heathen nations; and to provide for the necessities and peculiar circumstances of newly founded Churches.

The Church, however, felt that an authority which arose, in any degree, from a spirit of encroachment, could not fail to be ultimately injurious; and accordingly the third œcumenical synod, expressly forbad any patriarch to assume jurisdiction over Churches which had not from the beginning been subject to his see; lest, as they said, under the guise of religion, the swelling of worldly pride should find an entrance, the canons of the fathers be violated, and we imperceptibly lose that liberty which Christ purchased for us by his blood. According to this canon, is was unlawful for the Roman see to assume any ordinary jurisdiction A.D. 431.

in Britain; though, when religion had been oppressed by the heathen Saxons in that country, Pope Gregory acted most laudably in sending missionaries there to convert the barbarians. But this was only an act of charity, such as any Christian bishop might have done; and could not give his successors any right of jurisdiction in England, in opposition to the law of the œcumenical synod. Happy, indeed, had it been for religion, if the Roman Church had adhered to the spirit of this decree, and refrained from adding to its original and lawful jurisdiction.

The rival see of Constantinople now rose suddenly to dignity and power. When Constantine the Great removed the seat of empire from Rome to Constantinople, the bishop of that city soon obtained jurisdiction over the surrounding bishops of Thrace. The second œcumenical synod declared him second in dignity only to the bishop of Rome; and the fourth made them equal in dignity and authority, while it sanctioned the jurisdiction which St. Chrysostom and his successors had acquired over Asia Minor. The other patriarchs were those of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem; but the patriarch of Constantinople, who was given the title of "œcumenical, or universal patriarch" by the Roman emperors in the sixth century, became, and has always since continued, the head of the eastern Church.

A.D. 330.

A.D. 381.

A.D. 451.

The communion of Churches received several interruptions during this period. After the council of Sardica, the eastern and western bishops remained for some years estranged from mutual communion, in consequence of their contentions about St. Athanasius. A similar division was caused in the latter part of the same century by the ordination of two patriarchs of Antioch by different parties, one of whom was recognised by the eastern, and the other by the western Church. This division was healed by the pious care of St. Chrysostom. The deposition of that great man, and the

A.D. 341.

A.D. 362.

ordination of another in his place to the see of Constantinople, led to a division between the East and West, which continued for many years, until justice was done by the Churches of the East to the memory of that illustrious bishop. Another division arose, when Acacius, bishop of Constantinople, having caused the re-union of the Monophysites to the Church, on principles which left the authority of the fourth œcumenical synod in doubt, and thus compromised the truth, was deposed and excommunicated by Felix, bishop of Rome. The great body of the eastern bishops, though orthodox themselves, did not admit the propriety of this act; and the result was, that the eastern and western Churches were again estranged from mutual communion for twenty-five years. In the following century the Churches of Africa, Tuscany, Illyricum, and some others, refused for a time to admit the fifth œcumenical synod, and were out of communion with the rest of the Church; but on full inquiry, they adopted the general decision. The ancient British and Irish Churches, in the sixth and seventh centuries, were treated as schismatics by the Roman Church, in consequence of their adherence to their ancient customs,* and for not submitting to the authority of the papal see; but they were acknowledged as Christians by many Churches.

A.D. 404.

A.D. 482.

These divisions, however much they diminished the glory of the Church, did not altogether destroy the principle of Christian charity. It was still universally held that the Church formed but one spiritual fraternity; that all Christians were members of the same body; and that it was their duty to hold communion with each other. When divisions arose, excommunication consisted generally in a simple withdrawal of communion, without any sentence of anathema, or of total separation from Christianity. These withdrawals of communion were intended to procure the reformation of

* [For which they truly pleaded apostolical warrant, in the practice of St. John, derived to them through the churches of Gaul. Am. Ed.]

the offending party; and the divided Churches always retained the same principle of veneration for Scripture, as interpreted by the doctrine of the universal Church in all past ages, and sincerely endeavoured to be re-united to their brethren in Christ.

## CHAPTER X.

### ON THE RISE OF ABUSES AND CORRUPTIONS.

### A.D. 320-680.

The strong faith of the early Christians in some instances degenerated into credulity. Accustomed to the contemplation of the miracles recorded in the holy Scriptures, and still continuing to hear of occasional miracles wrought for the conversion of the heathen, they received with too ready a credence many tales of wonders and signs which superstition or imposture spread abroad. In western Europe, the ignorance of a long night of political barbarism and warfare rendered the multitude prone to the reception of such errors. Men of eminent sanctity were supposed to have the power of working miracles by their prayers; and the veneration which attached to their persons when living followed them beyond the grave.

The Church has not always been gifted with a spirit of wisdom and foreknowledge to discern the future abuses of opinions and practices, which it originally permitted without reproof. Could the pious fathers of the fourth century, who in their orations apostrophised the departed saints and martyrs, and called for their prayers to God, have foreseen the abuses to which this practice was to lead; could they have known that these expressions of an ardent, though somewhat unregulated feeling, were to induce others, in process of time, to adopt such invocations as a stated portion of their daily worship—to lead in later ages to actual *prayers* ad-

dressed to the saints themselves, and to cause such prayers and invocations almost to supplant the worship of God among the ignorant or superstitious,—they would have carefully avoided the introduction of a practice so dangerous to true religion. Yet during the period before us, the invocation of saints, however superfluous and unwise, neither usurped so large a portion of the worship of Christians, nor was in itself so censurable, as it became in after-ages. It consisted simply in addresses to the saints to pray to God for us; nor is there any evidence that it was a universal practice. The invocation of angels was directly prohibited by the council of Laodicea, in the fourth century; yet in the seventh it was introduced into some litanies of the western Church. The invocation of saints also appeared for the first time in public worship in these formularies.

The same affection, the same veneration, with which the spirits of the saints and martyrs were regarded by the early Christians, attended their earthly remains; and the same credulity of individuals led to the circulation of an opinion that even their inanimate relics could procure blessings for those who touched them with faith, since the dead bones of the prophet Elisha, the hem of our Lord's garment, and the handkerchiefs from St. Paul's body, had wrought miracles. Hence the relics of martyrs and saints were, in the fourth and following centuries, regarded with very great veneration in many parts of the Church; and they gradually even became temptations to the ignorant and enthusiastic, who too willingly received the tales of marvels which they were said to have worked, and sometimes seemed inclined to forget the Author and Giver of all good things, in their admiration of the gifts which they attributed to his creatures. The desire of possessing such relics became so great in the fifth and following centuries, that it led dishonest men to produce a number of spurious relics; so that, after the lapse of some ages, it became almost impossible to distinguish the true from the false. The custom of placing relics in churches, which

began in the fourth or fifth century, and became universal in the seventh, also contributed to swell the number of false relics. No one will deny that the remains of martyrs and holy men ought to be treated with honour and respect; but when this assumes the character of superstitious or idolatrous worship, the Church is bound to remove the cause of such abuses. It was this that led the Church of England, in the sixteenth century, to remove the alleged relics of saints,—a measure which was justified by a strong necessity.

It was a pious and natural feeling of love, which led many Christians, in the fourth and following centuries, to make pilgrimages to visit the scenes of our Saviour's life and death, and the tombs of the martyrs and saints whose virtues had adorned Christianity. But this custom led to serious abuses: it led clergy as well as laity to forsake the sphere of their appointed duties, and to consume their time in wandering over the earth. After the period of which I am now speaking, the evil increased much; and St. Boniface, about 750, complained of the disgrace which religion suffered from the sinful lives of many persons who had undertaken such journeys. This practice even became one means by which the ancient penitential discipline was subverted; for it was customary with some bishops, after the period now before us, to commute the lengthened canonical penances for pilgrimages to Jerusalem or to some other holy place.

The use of pictures or sculptures representing our Saviour, the chief events of sacred history, or the saints, was not unfrequent in the fifth and sixth centuries. These pictures were only intended for ornament, for the information of the ignorant, or to excite pious recollections: all worship to them was forbidden. St. Epiphanius, tore the vail of a church on which the picture of a saint was embroidered. Serenus, bishop of Marseilles, about 600, destroyed images which the people worshipped; and Pope Gregory the Great, while he questioned the propriety

A.D. 400.

of the act, yet equally disapproved of the abuse it was designed to prevent.

The evils of which I have been speaking were all engrafted on opinions or practices in themselves blameless or excusable; and it was frequently difficult to distinguish precisely between right and wrong; to trace the boundary between piety and superstition. But as the Scriptures were still understood by many of the people, we have reason to believe that such evils could not yet have been of a very serious character or wide prevalence.

Another evil was slowly growing, at the close of the period now under consideration. When Christianity was first disseminated, the earliest gift of the Holy Spirit was that of tongues, in order that every nation might hear in its own language the wonderful works of God, and that every tongue might confess that Jesus is the Lord. Accordingly, at first, every nation employed its own language in the worship of God; for, as St. Paul said to those who celebrated the eucharist in a language unknown to their hearers, "When thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say Amen, at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?"[1] Guided by these apostolical instructions, the Greeks used their own language in divine service. The Churches of Syria and Mesopotamia used the Syriac language; the native Egyptians Coptic; the Grecian colonies at Alexandria, and in Sicily and Naples, prayed in Greek. The Ethiopic was used in Abyssinia, the Armenian in Armenia, Sclavonic in Russia, and Illyric in Illyria. The Latin was vernacular in Italy, Africa, Spain, Gaul, and was employed in the liturgy of those Churches. Even after the Goths and other barbarous nations had invaded the West, the mass of the Christian population still spoke the Latin language; and for several ages it did not become so corrupted by the admixture of foreign words as to be unintelligible

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 16.

to the people. The same observation may be applied generally to the eastern Churches, in which the language of the liturgy long continued to be more or less understood by the people. The period in which it ceased to be so, must be placed after the ages now under consideration; but an unwisely-applied reverence for the ancient liturgies of the Church led, in the sixth and following centuries, to the adoption of Latin services in the newly-founded Churches of England, Germany, and the northern nations; a measure which was certainly much less excusable than the retention of the ancient language in the other parts of the West. It is true, indeed, that the validity of the sacraments was not vitally affected by their being administered in a language understood only by the minister, provided that the recipients were instructed in the meaning of the essential rites and prayers, and taught to unite their supplications with those of the Church: but this could only be an indifferent substitute for that united worship in voice and heart, which the Church had universally received from the apostles; and it had a tendency to cause, in the less informed part of the community, a blind and superstitious dependence on the effects of the sacraments, to the neglect of all preparation on their own parts, instead of an enlightened and spiritual apprehension of those sacred mysteries and graces which are conveyed by the sacraments only to the penitent and believing soul.

The discipline of the Church with regard to the marriage of the clergy was different in the East and the West. In the former, the clergy were generally married, though it was not permitted them to contract marriage after ordination. It was only in 692 that a different rule was adopted with regard to the oriental *bishops*, who were then obliged to observe celibacy: the remainder of the clergy have continued to follow the ancient practice even to the present day. The discipline of the *western* Church generally, from the fifth century, prohibited married clergy, as it was supposed that they could less perfectly devote themselves to the office of the

ministry. But the experience of ages showed that this discipline was very inexpedient, as it was plainly not enjoined by any Divine command; and from the tenth to the twelfth century considerable numbers of the western clergy were married; but the Roman pontiffs after that enforced celibacy with extreme severity.

The great majority of the early Christians, if we may judge by the writers of the first four centuries, held that immediately after this life the righteous were admitted to a region of peace and happiness: but as they believed that the soul would be re-united to the body at the last day, before ascending into heaven, and therefore that it was not yet in a state of such perfect blessedness as admitted of no increase; and as it was the opinion of many, that the saints were to rise from the dead before the rest of mankind, and to share in the glory of the millennium,—it was customary in the Church, from the remotest antiquity, to offer prayers for the perfect peace and joy of the departed believers, and for their participation in the first resurrection. It was also the opinion of Origen, and of several other fathers, that at the last day, all believers, without exception, shall pass through some fire, which shall purge away all traces of sin and imperfection, and render them meet for the presence of God. This opinion, however, was not received by Christians as an article of faith. St. Augustine, in the fifth century, regarded it only as "not incredible" that some of the faithful may after this life be saved by a sort of purifying fire. Gregory the Great, first maintained the doctrine that there is a purgatory fire, before the day of judgment, for slight faults not repented of in this life: this doctrine he founded chiefly on certain alleged visions of souls in torment for their sins. Thus began the doctrine of purgatory, which, however, was never received by the eastern Church, and was only gradually adopted in the West. Even in the twelfth century, as we learn from Otto of Frisingen, it was only held by "some" writers; and it was never de- A.D. 600.

clared an article of faith till 1438, in the council of Florence, the authority of which has always been doubtful even among Romanists.

## CHAPTER XI.

### PROGRESS OF CHRISTIANITY.

A.D. 680-1054.

THE period on which we now enter presents many painful features in the history of the Church. The temptations of heresy had indeed now been almost exhausted; and the human mind, wearied with novelties and dissensions, reposed itself more implicitly on the authority of the Church: but ignorance and barbarism were fast overspreading the traces of ancient civilization, and religion too often became mingled with superstition. The perpetual state of warfare between rival princes, the feebleness of governments, unable to control their powerful and turbulent subjects, caused a general lawlessness and disorder, destructive of those habits which are most congenial to Christianity. Add to this the incursions and ravages of Saracens, Danes, and Normans, which threw all the west of Europe into confusion; the insurrections and inroads of Saxons, Sclavonians, Hungarians, and Turks, which equally disturbed the east and the north; and we may then see the difficulties under which religion laboured, and which were in many respects most injurious to her. But even in these ages we continue to see the fulfilment of our Saviour's promises to his Church. The kingdom of Christ was still expanding itself from the river to the ends of the earth; the tree sprung from a grain of mustard-seed still showed the vigour of its constitution by putting forth new and flourishing branches; and the fruits of the Holy Spirit's influence, the pledge of our Lord's per-

petual presence with his body the Church, were abundantly manifested in the midst of many scandals and sins. It may be said with truth, I believe, that the progress of Christianity in the world during these dark ages was scarcely less than during the first three centuries of its existence.

In the eighth century, the Saracens crossed from Africa into Spain, and having subdued the forces of Roderic, the last king of the Goths, in a pitched battle, made themselves masters of the whole country. They even threatened France, but were defeated with dreadful slaughter by Charles Martel, and compelled to retire within the limits of Spain. They subdued Sardinia, and ravaged Italy and Sicily (of which last they afterwards took possession) so terribly, that in many places the number of towns was reduced by one half. Christianity, however, subsisted under the dominion of the Saracens in the West, as well as in the East, though much oppression was experienced by believers, and some were even delivered to death for the name of Jesus Christ. But the losses of the Church under the Saracen dominion were counterbalanced by numerous conversions in the north of Europe. Christianity was still spreading amongst the Anglo-Saxons; it was carried far and wide amongst the Thuringians, Frieslanders, and Hessians, in Germany, by St. Boniface, or Winfrid, a monk of the order of St. Benedict, and a native of England. Rupert and Corbinian, two French bishops, were invited by Theodo, duke of Bavaria, early in the eighth century, to preach the Gospel in his dominions; and the former baptised that prince, with a large number of his people. Christianity was then established and bishopries were founded in Bavaria. Firmin preached the Gospel with great zeal in Alsatia, Bavaria, and Switzerland; and Lebuin, a native of England, laboured amongst the Saxons. Carinthia received Christianity from Bavaria, the duke of Carinthia having requested Virgilius, bishop

A.D. 714.

A.D. 732.

A.D. 827.

A.D. 715-754

A.D. 766-780.

of Saltzburg, to send clergy to instruct his people. St. Virgilius, who was a native of Ireland, and remarkable for his learning and piety, afterwards visited Carinthia, and confirmed the new Christians in the faith. In the latter part of the eighth century, the Emperor Charlemagne having conquered the greater part of Germany and Hungary, established churches throughout his dominions, and obliged his subjects to adopt the Christian religion. In the early part of the ninth century, St. Anschar, a monk of Corby in Westphalia, laid the foundations of the Church in Cimbria, Denmark, and Sweden, in which he was assisted by Anthbert, Ebbo, and many other pious missionaries.

The eastern Church was now also engaging in the same holy work. Methodius and Cyril, two Greek monks, converted to Christianity the Mœsians, Bulgarians, Gazarians, Bohemians, and Moravians, about the middle of this century; and the Sclavonians, Aretani, and other nations of Dalmatia, having expressed a wish to embrace the Christian religion, they were instructed and baptised by missionaries from the eastern Church. The vast nations of Russia were also added to the Christian Church in this and the following century; first by the persuasions of the missionaries sent by Ignatius, patriarch of Constantinople, and afterwards by the example of Wlodimir, the sovereign of Russia, who was baptised in 987. The savage Normans, who had invaded and seized a portion of France, now followed the example of their duke Rollo, and embraced the faith; while the conversion of Sweden was completed by Sigfrid; and that of Norway by Guthebald, who went forth on this holy mission from the Church of England. Micislaus, duke of Poland, adopted the Christian religion in 995; and his example so wrought on his subjects, that in a few years they professed the faith, and many episcopal sees were founded in that country. Some of the Hungarians were converted and baptised by Hierotheus, a bishop

A.D. 867.

A.D. 912.

about A.D. 990.

who was sent to them from Constantinople ; about A.D. 950.
but the conversion of that nation is chiefly attributable to the pious zeal of their king Stephen, who having been educated a Christian, resolved to cause his subjects to embrace the true religion; and having subdued a revolt of his pagan subjects, soon after his accession to A.D. 997.
the throne, he devoted himself to the propagation of the Gospel with earnest prayer and almsgiving; and sending for Christian teachers from the adjoining countries, he encouraged and assisted them so effectually, that idolatry was entirely banished from his dominions, and ten bishops were ordained for the superintendence of the new Churches.

## CHAPTER XII.

### ON THE FAITH OF THE CHURCH.

### A.D. 680-1054.

That the faith of Christians during this period did not vary from what it had formerly been, is proved by the universal adoption of the Nicene creed as the rule of faith, and by the veneration felt by all believers for the decrees of the six holy œcumenical synods. The Trinity, incarnation, atonement, the necessity of Divine grace, original sin, the need of good works, and all the other doctrines taught from the beginning by the Church, were still universally believed. We hear little indeed in these ages, comparatively speaking, of heresies: those which did appear seem not to have had much influence. The errors concerning our Lord's nature, which were taught by Elipandus in Spain in the eighth century, and which were connected with the Nestorian heresy, were condemned by the great council of Frankfort in 794, and they disappeared soon afterwards. The doctrines of the Paulicians in the ninth century, and of Be-

rengarius* in the eleventh, seem to have obtained but few adherents; and we can scarcely point to any other errors in faith, which were at this time sustained by bodies of men. The same great truths of religion were universally adopted; the same Scriptures were diligently studied by all who had the means of doing so,—for in those days, before the invention of printing, when all books were transcribed by manual labour, they were both scarce and expensive; and an universal appeal was made to the sentiments of the ancient fathers and councils in the interpretation of the Bible.

The grand controversy of the eighth century was on a point of Christian morality—the use of images. It is admitted, even by those who approve most highly of their use, that it is no part of Christian duty to possess such memorials; that there is no injunction to that effect in holy Scripture; and that it would be idolatrous to offer them any adoration, as if they were deities, or to attribute to them any peculiar power in themselves. Yet experience informs us that the use of images cannot long continue without the danger of such errors.

We have already seen instances of a tendency to superstition with regard to images. This was carried still further in the East in the course of the seventh and eighth centuries; so that the people in order to do honour to the saints and martyrs, bowed, lighted candles, and offered incense before their pictures. It is true that, in acting thus, it was intended rather to honour the saints themselves than their pictures; but the tendency of such customs to cause superstition and even idolatry amongst the ignorant, is too obvious to be overlooked. The Greek emperors, Leo, Con-

* [It is very questionable whether Berengar is chargeable with any error: indeed, there is hardly room for doubt that his troubles grew out of his firm adherence to the doctrine of the Church concerning the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist in its simple form, in opposition to the novel and heretical explanations of Paschasius Ratbert and others, since adopted by the Church of Rome.—Am. Ed.]

stantine Caballinus, and several of their successors in the eighth and ninth centuries, seeing these abuses, and desirous to free the Church from them, commenced reformation by breaking down all images, and persecuting those who wished to retain them. To accomplish their object, originally good, the Iconoclasts did not hesitate to condemn the use of any pictures, as absolutely contrary to the word of God, and thus placed themselves in the attitude of arraigning the practice of the universal Church for some centuries as anti-Christian; a line of argument which was as inconsistent with trust in the Divine promises as it was with Christian charity. The western Church at this time generally permitted the use of pictures or images, but forbade any sort of religious honour or worship to be paid to them; and hence, when the bishops of the East, to the number of 338, assembled in synod at Constantinople, and condemned the use of images as idolatrous, the western Churches disapproved of the decree. A.D. 754.

After many years, the party in favour of images obtained a temporary triumph in the East, on a change of government. A synod of 350 bishops at Nice, reversed the decision formerly made at Constantinople, and decreed the lawfulness of images, and the propriety of paying to them a certain honour, by bowing, lighting candles, and offering incense before them, which honour was supposed to pass to the person represented, and to be altogether different from the worship which is due to God only. But this synod was soon afterwards rejected by the eastern Church, and so remained till the year 842; while the bishops of the West, to the number of 300, in the great synod of Frankfort, annulled the decrees of the synod of Nice, which they forbade to be numbered amongst the œcumenical synods, and rejected all worship of images. The western Churches remained for several centuries in the same sentiments. The historians and other writers, from the eighth to the fourteenth century, almost always term the A.D. 787. A.D. 794.

synod of Nice a "pseudo-synod," or "false synod," and condemn its doctrine. It was observed by a Greek writer in the time of the crusades (the twelfth century) that the Germans did not permit the use of images. However, at length, superstition in this respect became very common in the West, —an evil which was very much caused by the support always given by the bishops of Rome to the decisions of the Nicene synod.

It appears plainly, from a review of the whole history, that it was always the wish and *intention* of the universal Church, to prevent any idolatrous or divine worship of images, and to direct the veneration of Christians to the persons whom they represent. But this intention could not be realised in the case of the ignorant and superstitious, who must always form a great portion of the community; they were placed in most imminent danger of worshipping the images themselves with divine honours; and we know that in later times the abuses in this respect were most lamentable. The removal of images at the Reformation was, in fact, only carrying out the intention of the universal Church in the eighth and following centuries, when experience had amply proved that they could not generally be used without danger of idolatry. It had been held by Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, even in the ninth century, that images ought to be destroyed when they gave rise to idolatrous abuses; as Hezekiah had broken the brazen serpent when it was worshipped by the people.

In the ninth century the doctrine of the holy eucharist became the subject of discussion. It had never been denied by the Catholic Church, that this sacrament, when consecrated, continues to be bread and wine, according to the words of the apostle, "The *bread* which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" and of our Lord, "I will drink no more of this *fruit of the vine*," &c. But Paschasius Ratbert, a French monk, in the ninth century, attempted to prove that the sacrament is no longer bread and wine after

the consecration, but only the real body and blood of Christ, the same in all respects with that which was born of the Virgin. This doctrine, which has been termed the doctrine of transubstantiation in later ages, gradually obtained many adherents in the western Churches, though it was opposed at first by several of the most eminent divines. Scotus, in opposing it, fell into serious errors, as he declared the eucharist to be a bare *sign* of the body and blood of Christ, contrary to the universal belief of the Church;[1] and in this error he was followed by Berengarius in the eleventh century,* whose doctrine was justly condemned by several councils; though it is to be regretted, that his opponents occasionally used expressions with reference to the eucharist, which were inconsistent with the spiritual character of that holy mystery. This controversy only existed in the western Churches; the eastern Churches continued to retain their ancient doctrines undisturbed.

During these ages, the practice of private confession to a priest was not held generally to be a matter of necessity. We have already seen this custom abolished (as a pre-requisite to the reception of the eucharist) in the East, by Nectarius, patriarch of Constantinople in the fourth century, and by the majority of the eastern Church. It was still practised in many parts of the West, but was not regarded as an essential of religion. Bede and Alcuin recommended Christians to confess to the ministers of God all the grievous sins which they could remember. But others, as we learn from Alcuin and Haymo, would not confess their sins to the priest;

[1] The Catechism of the Church of England declares that "the body and blood of Christ" are "verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper." And the twenty-seventh Homily says that "in the supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent."

* [This was long held to be the case; yet not without doubt. See *Mosheim*. But it has lately been disproved, by the publication of a treatise of Berengar, fuller and later than any before known, which plainly shows his view of the sacrament to have been different from that of Scotus. See above, p. 78, note.—Am. Ed.]

but said, "it was sufficient for them to confess their sins to God alone, provided that they ceased from those sins for the time to come." The council of Cavaillon, in the time of the Emperor Charlemagne, aknowledged that it was still a matter of doubt whether confession to the priests was necessary, in addition to confession before God; and they attributed the pardon of sins to the latter. "Some persons say that they ought to confess their sins only to God, and some think that they are to be confessed unto the priests; both of which, not without great fruit, is practised within the holy Church. Namely, thus; that we both confess our sins unto God, who is the forgiver of sins, (saying with David, 'I acknowledge my sins unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid.' 'I said, I will confess against myself, my transgressions unto the Lord; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin;) and, according to the institution of the apostle, confess our sins one unto another, and pray one for another, that we may be healed. The confession therefore which is made unto God purgeth sins; but that which is made unto the priest teacheth in what sort those sins should be purged." A.D. 813.

It may perhaps be advisable to carry our view of this subject beyond the period now under consideration, and to notice the difference of opinions in the western Church previously to the Reformation. Gratian, about 1130, collected the opposite decisions of the ancients as to the necessity of external confession, and concluded thus: "Upon what authorities, or upon what strength of reasons, both these opinions are grounded, I have briefly laid open. But whether of them we should rather cleave to, is reserved to the judgment of the reader. For both of them have for their favourers both wise and religious men." The council of Lateran directed the faithful to confess their sins to a priest once a-year; but, notwithstanding this, the *necessity* of such a confession was not generally admitted. Semeca, the earliest commentator on the canon law; Michael of Bononia, prior general of the Carmelites; Panormitanus, A.D. 1215.

and a number of eminent writers, asserted that confession to a priest was not instituted by God, but introduced solely by the authority of the Church, and that it was not necessary for the pardon of sin. And this difference of opinion existed in all Churches of the Roman communion, until the council of Trent, when the divine institution and absolute necessity of confession to a priest were declared to be articles of faith, which no one should deny on pain of anathema.

---

## CHAPTER XIII.

### ON THE FRUITS OF FAITH.

### A.D. 680-1054.

I HAVE already adverted to the great difficulties under which religion now laboured from the disorganization of temporal governments, and the ravages of barbarians. During these ages, nothing was more frequent than the usurpation of ecclesiastical revenues by kings and feudal lords, or their desecration by the appointment of clergy who were incapacitated by youth or ignorance for the discharge of their duties, and who had nothing to recommend them but nobility of birth. These abuses occurred particularly within the dominions of the emperors in Italy, France, and Germany, where it had been the policy of Charlemagne and his successors to invest the bishops and monasteries with great territories and princely dignities, in the hope that these ecclesiastics would prove more faithful and obedient subjects than the temporal barons, whose turbulence they had found it so difficult to repress. Churches and monasteries were frequently burned or pillaged by the feudal chieftains, or by Saracens, Normans, and Danes. Thus the schools of learning were extinguished, discipline became relaxed amidst the general confusion; and while the clergy were in many places insuf-

ficiently educated, the laity fell into extreme ignorance and degradation. We find grievous lamentations over such evils amongst the writers of these ages; yet there is every reason to believe that there was a spirit of repentance at work which could not fail to produce very salutary effects. Those bishops who, when assembled in solemn council, had the courage to proclaim before the world their own remissness, and to confess their sins, with resolution of amendment, could neither have been deficient in a knowledge of their duty, nor in a spirit of Christian humility and repentance.

A.D. 909. Hervey, archbishop of Rheims, and eleven other bishops assembled at Troslé in France, spoke thus: "As the first men lived without law and without fear, given up to their passions, so every one now doeth as he pleases, despising all laws human and divine, and the directions of the bishops. The powerful oppress the weak: violence against the poor, and the plunder of ecclesiastical possessions, are universal. And that it may not be imagined that we spare ourselves—we who ought to correct others: we have indeed the name, but we do not fulfil the duties of bishops. We neglect preaching; we see those who are committed to our care abandon God and fall into sin, without addressing them and stretching forth our hands; and if we wish to reprove them, they say as in the gospel, that we bind on them heavy burdens, and will not touch them ourselves with the end of our fingers. Thus the Lord's flock perishes through our silence. Let us think what sinner has ever been converted by our discourses, or who has renounced debauchery, avarice, pride. Yet we shall render an account without ceasing of this business, which has been intrusted to us, in order that we may gain profit by it." "It has happened through our negligence, our ignorance, and that of our brethren, that there are found in the Church an innumerable multitude of people of every sex and condition, who arrive at old age without ever being instructed in the faith, so that they are ignorant even of the words of the Creed and

Lord's Prayer. If there should seem to be any thing good in their lives, yet how can they do good works without the foundation of faith?" These expressions, and the earnest exhortations of the synod, show that there was still a spirit of real repentance in this part of the Church, notwithstanding the multitude of evils and sins.

Nor has there ever been a period in the history of the Church, when the spirit of religion, where it existed, was more ardent and earnest. The religion of these times was less learned, less accomplished, less free from superstition, than that of earlier ages; but it can scarcely be said to have been less zealous, less productive of good works. Its characteristics were, the deepest humility, renouncement of self, denial of the passions, and even the enjoyments and pleasures of the world; the concentration of all wishes and desires in the glory of God, and the promotion of practical religion; boundless charity to the poor; the foundation of churches, schools, and religious houses; diligent study of the Scripture, singing of psalms, and much prayer. We see not merely one or two, but hundreds of men forsaking all their earthly prospects, the resorts of their youth and the paths of ambition, to devote themselves to the conversion of the heathen. We see them desiring and rejoicing to die for Christ; and by their patience, piety, and wisdom, bringing multitudes of heathen into the way of salvation. We see many of the most powerful monarchs engaged in all the exercises of continual devotion and charity, or descending from the summit of earthly grandeur to spend the remainder of their days in penitence and prayer. However sad may have been the calamities of the Church, and however great the faults of Christians, yet when we see such things as these, we cannot refrain from the conviction that the Spirit of God was still influencing the hearts of many people; nor fail to perceive that the Lord was still, according to his promise, always with his Church.

Beda, the most learned and celebrated writer of the eighth

century, lived and died an humble recluse in the monastery of Yarrow in England. All his life was devoted to the attainment of various knowledge, diversified only by the monastic exercises of psalmody, prayer, and manual labour. His earlier years were applied to the acquisition of Latin, Greek, versification, astronomy, arithmetic, music, and other sciences, as well as to the study of holy Scripture, to which last he gave himself more entirely when he was ordained a presbyter. His works, which consist of commentaries on Scripture, homilies, lives of saints, an admirable history of the Church of England from the earliest period, and other treatises, fill eight folio volumes. Bede was eminently distinguished for piety, humility, and all the graces of the Christian character; he was diligent as a preacher, as an instructor of the ignorant, and as a spiritual adviser of those who sought his aid. Amongst his friends was a bishop named Egbert, to whom Bede addressed an excellent letter of advice. "Before all things," he said, "avoid useless conversations, and apply yourself to meditate on the holy Scriptures, especially the Epistles of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus, and also on the Pastoral of St. Gregory, and his homilies on the Gospel. As it is not fitting to employ the sacred vessels in profane uses, it is not less unbecoming that he who is consecrated to minister at the altar should, on leaving the church, discourse or act in a manner unbecoming his station." He urged the bishop to establish presbyters in every village to instruct and administer the sacraments, and that they ought to take especial care that all people knew by heart the Creed and Lord's Prayer; and that those who did not understand Latin ought to repeat them in their own language, whether they were laity, clergy, or monks. Bede had already translated them into English, for the use of many ignorant clergy. He also exhorted the bishop to teach the benefits of frequent communion, as practised in Italy, France, Africa, Greece, and the East; for even the most pious persons in England, as he says, only communicated at Christ-

mas, Epiphany, and Easter; though there were infinite multitudes of people who could easily communicate on all Sundays and feast-days, as was the custom at Rome.

Bede died in 735, aged sixty-three. About a fortnight before Easter, he experienced a difficulty of breathing; but he spent the remainder of his time, till Ascension-day, in joy and thanksgiving, instructing his disciples by day, and spending much of his time, even at night, in singing psalms. He frequently repeated parts of Scripture appropriate to his state, some of which he had translated into English verse. He was still engaged in dictating to Cuthbert a translation of St. John's Gospel into English, and was thus employed on Ascension-day, when feeling his end approach, he sent hastily for the presbyters of the monastery, and having presented to them some small memorials of his regard, he bespoke their religious assistance and prayers for him, and then, extended on the pavement of his cell, full of confidence and joy, and singing Gloria Patri, he departed to his eternal reward.

Such virtues were not confined to the cloister in these ages; they sometimes adorned the throne. Luitprand, king of the Lombards, in the early part of the eighth century, affords an example of this. He was pious, chaste, good, valiant, and wise, though he was ignorant of letters. He applied himself to prayer and almsgiving; caused an oratory to be built in his palace, and established clergy to chaunt divine service for him every day: he built churches at every place where he resided. Carloman, prince of the Franks, was celebrated for his victories over the Germans, Bavarians, and Saxons. He for a long time protected and encouraged the missionary labours of St. Boniface, and showed many indications of a religious mind. At length, finding himself a widower, and being penitent for the severities he had formerly exercised on some of his rebellious subjects, he resolved to retire from the world, and to devote himself to the worship of God. He accordingly resigned his throne, and passed the remainder

A.D. 724-755.

of his days in the monastery founded by St. Benedict at Mount Casino, where he exercised every sort of self-denial, and, like the other brethren, undertook the humble offices of keeping the sheep, labouring in the garden, and even serving in the kitchen.

A.D. 768-814.

Religion was deeply indebted to the Emperor Charlemagne. He devoted himself with the greatest zeal to its propagation amongst the heathen nations subject to his dominion; and endeavoured to correct the disorders into which the Churches of France and Germany had fallen. His last days, after the coronation of his son Louis, were occupied in correcting the text of the four Evangelists, in which he was assisted by Greeks and Syrians. Charlemagne had long shown a great zeal for religion; he never failed, while his health permitted, to attend divine service daily, morning and evening. He took great care that the service should be conducted with decorum and propriety; supplied his chapels with abundance of vestments and ornaments; and being perfectly instructed in the best manner of reading and singing, he corrected the mode of performing both; but he himself never read publicly in church, but contented himself with singing in a low tone and with others. His alms were not only liberally bestowed in his own dominions, but on all the poor and distressed Christians in Syria, Egypt, Africa, Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Carthage; and he cultivated the friendship of unbelieving princes, with a view to assuage the sufferings of the Christians under their dominion. He died A.D. 814.

The Emperor Louis, his son, who died in 840, usually spent the whole time of Lent in singing psalms, prayer, attendance on divine service, distributing alms, and other works of piety; so that he scarcely took more than a day or two to mount his horse for the purpose of exercise.

But I must now turn to some of the eminent missionaries who adorned the Church in the eighth and ninth centuries.

ST. BONIFACE, or Winfrid, was a native of England, where

he embraced the monastic life at an early age, and was ordained presbyter, by desire of his abbot, in 710; after which he devoted himself to the instruction of the people, and laboured for the salvation of souls. When he was held in most high esteem in his own country, he resolved to forsake all the worldly prospects which were opening on him, and to devote himself to the conversion of the heathen. Accompanied by some monks, he embarked, and passed over into Friesland and Hesse, where, after some time, he converted and baptised many thousands of the people, and founded a monastery. Whilst he was thus occupied, Boniface and his companions were frequently reduced to great difficulty, from the extreme poverty of the people. They were obliged to live by the labour of their own hands, and were exposed to continual danger from the inroads of the pagan Saxons. At length Boniface went to Rome, by desire of Pope Gregory II., who ordained him bishop for the mission among the heathen east of the Rhine. Returning to the scene of his labours, he confirmed those whom he had baptised, and having boldly cut down a tree of immense size, called the oak of Jupiter, which was held in superstitious veneration by the people, he gained a large increase of converts. Boniface felt himself much impeded in the work of preaching the Gospel by the sinful lives and errors of the neighbouring bishops and clergy; and consulted Gregory and other bishops, whether he ought to hold any communion with such men. He corresponded frequently with Daniel, bishop of Winchester, and received from him very judicious advice, as to the best method of arguing with the heathen. Boniface was a diligent student of the Scriptures. In a letter to his friend Daniel, A.D. 726. he says, "I pray you to send me the book of the prophets, which the abbot Winbert, formerly my master, left me when dying, in which six prophets are comprised in the same volume, written in very distinct letters. You cannot send me a greater consolation in my old age; for I cannot find a book like it in this country; and my sight being

feeble, I cannot easily distinguish small and contracted letters."

The fame of St. Boniface now attracted a great number of religious men from England, who assisted him in his apostolic labours, and converted multitudes of people in Hesse and Thuringia, so that in 732 he was made archbishop (his see being fixed at Mayence,) and empowered to constitute bishops to assist him, which he accordingly did in Bavaria, and other parts of Germany. In 742 he held a council under the protection of Carloman, prince of the Franks, for the reformation of the Church in the west of France, where there had been no metropolitan for eighty years, no councils had been held, and the sees had been filled either with laymen, or with bishops altogether unworthy of the name. In this council it was resolved that the metropolitans should in future request the pall from the bishop of Rome. The views of St. Boniface, with regard to the duties of his station, appear in a letter to Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury, written about this time, in which, after complaining of the difficulties which beset him, he says, "Let us combat for the Lord; for we are in days of affliction and anguish. Let us die, if it be the will of God, for the holy laws of our fathers, that with them we may arrive at an eternal inheritance. Let us not be dumb dogs, sentinels asleep, or hirelings who flee at the sight of the wolf; let us be careful and vigilant shepherds, preaching to great and small, to rich and poor, to every age and every condition, as God shall give us power, in season and out of season."

In 752 he crowned Pepin king of France; and though now full of years, of honours, and of fame, he continued to act as a missionary to the end of his life. We find him in 754 returning from Friesland, where he had been for a long time preaching to the heathen. In the following year, having ordained Lullus to be his successor, and resigned his see to him, as he was about to depart to Friesland, he said to the new archbishop, "The time of my death draws near: com-

plete, my son, the building of the churches I have begun in Thuringia: apply thee earnestly to the conversion of the people: finish the church of Fulda, and bury me there. Prepare all that is necessary for my journey; and place with my books a winding sheet to bury me." At these words, Lullus wept. St. Boniface then exhorted the abbess Lioba, his old friend, to remain still in that foreign country, and to observe her profession, looking for an eternal reward; and he commanded that she should be buried in his tomb. He then departed by the Rhine to Friesland, where he converted and baptised thousands of the heathen, overthrew their temples, and raised churches. He was assisted by the bishop of Utrecht, and many priests, deacons, and monks. He had fixed a day for the confirmation of his converts, and was encamped with his brethren on the banks of a river; when on the day appointed, they were surrounded by a furious band of heathens. The attendants of St. Boniface went forth to oppose them by force; but he called his clergy together, and said to his attendants, "My children, cease to combat; the Scripture instructs us not to render evil for evil. The day which I have long expected is come; put your hope in God, and he shall save your souls." He then exhorted his clergy and companions to prepare themselves courageously for martyrdom, and soon after fell beneath the swords of the heathen, in the seventy-fifth year of his age.

Gregory, a disciple of Boniface, governed the church newly founded at Utrecht, where he collected, with great trouble and expense, many volumes of the holy Scriptures; and he also preached to the heathen in Friesland. Two of his brothers having been murdered by robbers, the murderers were arrested, and sent bound to him, to suffer death in whatever manner he should please; for by the laws of that barbarous people, the nearest relative of a murdered person was invested with this power. Gregory ordered them to be washed, clothed, and fed; then he said to them, "Go in peace; never again commit such a deed, lest a worse thing

happen to you; and beware of the other relations of the deceased." Gregory was simple in his habits; pretended not to hear what was unkindly said of him; and treated his calumniators as if they were his best friends. Whenever he received any money, he immediately distributed it amongst the poor, keeping no valuables whatsoever, except the sacred vessels of the church. When this holy man felt his end approaching, he caused himself to be carried into the church, and there, having made his prayer, and received the body and blood of our Saviour, he died—his last look fixed on the altar.

LEBUIN, an Anglo-Saxon, and a disciple of Gregory, preached among the Saxons in Germany; and on one occasion, hearing that a great assembly of the nation was to take place, he presented himself on the day appointed, arrayed in his vestments, with the Gospel and the cross in his hands. The assembly commenced by sacrificing to their false gods; in the midst of which, Lebuin began with a loud voice to preach the Gospel, and exhorted the people to turn from those superstitions to the worship of the true God; for that otherwise, he predicted, they would suffer most grievous calamities, and be reduced to captivity by a neighbouring prince. When the Saxons were about to deprive him of life for this boldness, one of them named Buto, who was generally respected, said, "Listen to me, ye that are wise: the ambassadors of the neighbouring people have often come to us, and we have received them peaceably, listened to their proposals, and sent them away with gifts. Here is an ambassador of the great God, who brings to you salutary promises from Him; and you reject, and wish to slay him: ye ought to fear God's anger." This discourse had such an effect on the Saxons, that Lebuin departed in safety, and continued his missionary labours.

A.D. 690-740.

There were several instances in these ages, of martyrdoms for the name of Christ. A remarkable example of this occurs in the history of the ninth century. The chief of the

Saracens having taken the town of Amorium in Asia Minor, sent the principal men and the military officers to Bagdad, where they underwent a long and rigorous imprisonment; and when it was supposed that their patience was exhausted, every possible effort was made to induce them to change their religion. But in vain did the most learned Mahomedan doctors assail their faith with arguments, promises, and threats: all were alike fruitless. At the end of seven years of imprisonment, they were again offered liberty and life, on condition of joining in the Moslem worship. The renegade who made this offer exhorted them, to give an external submission, for that God would surely pardon them, on account of the necessity in which they were placed. This insidious advice was rejected. On the following day the Christians were brought forth from their prison; and the caliph's officer, after inquiring their resolution, said, "You will not then pray with the caliph? I know that there are some of you who desire to do so; when the remainder shall see how these are honoured, they will deplore their own evil fate." The Christians replied with one voice, "We pray the only true God, that not only the caliph, but the whole nation of the Arabs, may renounce the errors of Mahomet, and adore Jesus Christ, who was announced by the prophets and the apostles. So far are we from renouncing light for darkness." "Beware," replied the officer, "of what ye say, lest ye repent it. Your disobedience will bring grievous torments upon you." They answered, "We commend our souls to God, and hope that, even to our last breath, he will give us strength not to renounce this faith." The officer said, "At the day of judgment ye shall be reproved for leaving your children orphans, and your wives widowed. The wealth of Egypt might enrich your descendants, even to the tenth generation." The Christians cried, "Anathema to Mahomet, and to all who acknowledge him as a prophet!" Then their hands were bound behind them, and they were A.D. 838.

brought to the banks of the river Tigris, where they were all executed, according to their rank.

We have already seen, that the study of Scripture was frequent in these ages. Lupus, abbot of Ferrieres, in the ninth century, writing to Godeschalch, a man of a vain and inquisitive turn of mind, speaks thus: "I exhort you, my venerable brother, not to fatigue your mind with such questions, lest in occupying yourself too much therewith, you may be unable to examine or to teach what is more useful. Why inquire so much into that which it may be unfit for us to know? Let us exercise ourselves in the vast field of the holy Scriptures; apply ourselves entirely to study them, and unite prayer with study. It will be worthy of the goodness of God to manifest himself to us in the manner most suitable to us, when we do not inquire into what is above us." The Council of Pavia in 850, in giving instructions with regard to the life and conduct of a bishop, said, "He shall meditate continually on holy Scripture, in order to instruct his clergy accurately, and to preach to the people according to their understanding." The instruction of the people was carried on chiefly by catechising and sermons, which were delivered in the language of each country. Jonas, bishop of Orleans, in writing on the duties of the laity, recommends to parents and godfathers the instruction of children, and complains that the ancient penitential discipline was much relaxed, and that most of the laity received the eucharist only three times a-year. Several bishops were very active in the discharge of their sacred duties. Thus it is said that Wolfgang, bishop of Ratisbon, who died in 994, preached often to his people, who came to hear him with great eagerness. His discourses were simple and intelligible, but strong and touching. He penetrated to the depths of their hearts, and caused floods of tears to flow. When he visited the clergy of his diocese, he carefully instructed

A.D. 828-861.

A.D. 829.

them in their duties, and particularly urged them to purity of life.

St. Fidus, bishop of Meissen in Germany, who died in 1015, afforded another example of zeal in the performance of his duties. Brought up in a religious community at Magdeburgh, he only accepted the episcopal office that he might win souls to God. His self-denial was very great: He was continually occupied for the remaining twenty-three years of his life in preaching, baptising, confirming, not only in his own, but in many other dioceses. The continual tears, which expressed his penitence and humility, are said to have weakened his sight. He often went with bare feet on his journeys; and when provision failed him, or he found himself suffering some other difficulty or hardship, he returned thanks to God, and desired his companions to do the same.

England produced many religious princes in these ages, the most conspicuous of whom was King Alfred, whose undaunted courage in adversity, and wisdom in prosperity, justly gained for him the reputation of being the greatest monarch of his age. The piety of his private life was truly remarkable. He divided his revenue into two equal parts, one of which he applied entirely to works of charity, in the proportions of one quarter to the poor generally; another to two monasteries he had founded; a third to the schools he had established; and a fourth to the monasteries in general, not only in England, but abroad. His time was also divided into two equal parts, one of which was given to religion. He attended the celebration of the eucharist every day; joined in divine service seven other times in the course of the day; and even went to the church secretly at night to pray. He devoted time to reading and meditation, and always carried with him the Psalter and Prayer book, and a sheet of paper, on which he wrote every day the passages of Scripture which touched him the most; then having collected these sheets, he made a

A.D. 872-901.

manual, which he used to read with singular pleasure. King Alfred found the education of the clergy and people reduced to the lowest ebb when he ascended the throne: this effect had been produced by the dreadful ravages of the Danes, and the almost total destruction of monasteries, which were at that time the only schools of learning. As soon as public tranquillity was restored, Alfred applied himself to the revival of literature and learning; and for this purpose he sent for the most learned men who could be found in the neighbouring countries, and afforded every possible encouragement to the instruction of the clergy and people. At this period there was a celebrated school at Oxford, which seems to have existed for some time, and which was in after-ages known as the University of Oxford. Alfred brought Grimbald and other doctors to Oxford; but a division arose between these new teachers and the ancient doctors, which the king had much difficulty in terminating.

He was more than twelve years old before he learned to read, and had not leisure, for many years, to apply himself to study. When peace was restored, he devoted himself, with the aid of learned men, to translate such books into English as he judged would be most useful to the people: amongst others, the Psalms of David, St. Gregory's Pastoral and Dialogues, the histories of Orosius and Bede, and the Consolations of Boëtius. In the preface to the Pastoral he says, that in his time but few of the English at this side of the Humber understood their commonest prayers, or could translate any Latin writing into English. He did not recollect to have met any one south of the Thames who could do so when he began to reign, though at the time he was writing there were many persons who were able to teach. "I remember," he says, "before these last ravages (of the Danes,) I have seen the churches of England full of ornaments and books; but the clergy did not derive much benefit from them, because they did not understand them; and our ancestors did not translate them into the vernacular tongue, because they

did not imagine that we should ever fall into such ignorance." He therefore thought it very advisable to translate the most necessary books into English; and that all the English youth, especially the free-born, should learn to read.*

This excellent prince was grievously afflicted with bodily pains all his life; but his piety never failed. He would pardon a heathen any crime that he might have committed, on condition of his becoming a Christian. All the leisure he had from war and business was devoted to study, and to inquiring how he might do good to others, and improve himself in virtue. He died in peace, A.D. 901.

I now turn to an instance of piety in a very different sphere of life. ST. NILUS was born in Calabria, of Greek parentage, in the tenth century. His natural abilities were carefully cultivated by study in his youth. He read holy Scripture continually, and delighted in the lives of the fathers: but when he was in the flower of his youth he fell into sins, from which he was after a time delivered by the grace of God operating on his conscience during his recovery from a violent fever. He then resolved to devote himself wholly to the worship and service of God, and to all the exercises of a religious life; and with this mind he entered a monastery in Calabria, where he was joyfully received; but wishing for more quiet than he found there, he retired to a cavern near at hand, where he spent his days between prayer, copying psalters and other religious books, singing the psalms, and studying holy Scripture and the fathers. In the evening he left his cell to walk abroad and refresh himself, and meditate on some passages of the fathers, without ever forgetting God, whom he contemplated in all the works of creation. After sun-set he took his frugal meal, and in the night he slept but for a short time, and then recited the psalms till day-light. His fasts were frequent and long.

One of the brethren, having obtained his permission to live

* [See Sir Francis Palgrave's admirable little work on the history of the Anglo-Saxons.—AM. ED.]

along with him, said to him, "My father, I have three pieces of silver; what wilt thou that I should do with them?" Nilus replied, "Give them to the poor, and keep only your psalter." He did so; but some time after, being wearied of such a life, he sought to quarrel with Nilus, and demanded the money which he had given to the poor. "My brother," said the holy man, "write on a piece of paper that I shall receive the reward of it in heaven, and place it on the altar." Then he departed, borrowed the money, which he gave to the man, and in twelve days copied three psalters, with which he paid his debt. Nilus afterwards refused to be made abbot of the neighbouring convent. One of the principal inhabitants of that part of the country having resolved to live a religious life, and desiring to place himself under his direction, and imitate his mode of living, Nilus dissuaded him from it, saying, "My brother, it is not for our virtue that we live in this desert, but it is because we cannot bear the rule of common life, that we have separated ourselves from men, like lepers. You do well to seek your salvation. Go to some community where you will find repose of body and mind." As the Saracens were making many inroads into that country, Nilus departed to another place, where several disciples joined him, and a monastery was formed. Some brethren in the neighbourhood spoke evil of him as a hypocrite and impostor, but he returned it only by giving them blessings and praise; and one day, when they had extremely maltreated him, he came to them as they were eating, placed himself on his knees, and asked their pardon. By this conduct he entirely subdued them, and gained their friendship. He would not allow any member of his community to possess any thing but what was barely necessary, saying that any thing more was avarice. When the society increased, he would never assume the title of abbot or hegumenus. One day, the metropolitan of Calabria, accompanied by several great men, magistrates, clergy, and a number of people, came to visit him out of curiosity. He caused one of them

to read part of a book in which it was written, "that of ten thousand souls, scarcely one at the present time departs into the angel's hands." Many began to say, "God forbid: this is heresy. Where then is the use of baptism, adoring the cross of Christ, receiving the communion, and bearing the name of Christians?" Nilus replied, "What if I show you that the fathers, St. Paul, and the Gospel, say the same thing? God is under no obligation to you for what you speak of. You would not dare to profess any heresy: the people would stone you. But know ye, that if ye be not virtuous, yea, exceedingly virtuous, ye shall not escape eternal punishment." Being asked of what tree Adam eat in Paradise, he said, "How should we speak of what Scripture has not revealed to us? Instead of thinking how ye were created; how ye were placed in Paradise; of the commandments ye have received, and have not kept; of what has driven you from Paradise, and how ye may enter it again; instead of all this, ye inquire the name of a tree!" Many great officers offered him large sums of money for the benefit of his community; but he said to them, "My brethren will be happy, according to the psalm, if they live of the labour of their hands; and the poor will cry against you for retaining their goods."

When the archbishop of Rossano died, the magistrates and principal clergy came to seek for St. Nilus, to offer him the see; but, having heard of their intentions, he retired into the recesses of the mountains, and could not be found; so that they were obliged to elect another person to that see. The incursions of the Saracens at length became so frequent, that Nilus was obliged to take refuge at the monastery of Mount Casino, which St. Benedict had founded. On his way thither, he passed through Capua, and his fame was so great, that he was offered the bishopric of that city. Nilus lived near Mount Casino for fifteen years with his community. In 997, when very aged, he went to Rome to beseech the emperor and the pope to have mercy on the antipope Philagathus, whom he had known formerly. The em-

peror and Pope Gregory, having heard of his arrival, went to meet him, and each taking him by a hand, led him to the patriarchal palace, and seated him between them, each kissing his hand. The old man groaned at receiving these honours; yet he endured them, in the hope of obtaining what he desired. He then said to them, "Spare me, for the sake of God. I am the greatest sinner of all men; an old man, half dead, and unworthy of these honours: it is rather my part to prostrate myself before you, and to honour your supreme dignities."

Finding at length that his community at Valdeluce had become seriously relaxed in discipline by the wealth, numbers, and renown, which his sanctity had given to it, he departed and went to a place near Gaëta. "The monks of these times," he said, "do not employ their leisure in prayer, meditation, and reading of Scripture, but in vain discourse, evil thoughts, and useless curiosity. These and many other evils are removed by labour, which distracts the attention from them; and there is nothing equal to eating our bread in the sweat of our countenance."

The princess of Gaëta came to visit him, out of reverence for his piety, and he discoursed to her on purity, almsgiving, and the fear of God. It was always unpleasant to him to meet the great: he avoided it carefully, as a source of vanity and danger, and had no intercourse with them even by letter, except to assist them in their necessities and their misfortunes. Nilus died soon after, in 1002, aged ninety-five.

---

## CHAPTER XIV.

### ON THE ABUSES AND SUPERSTITIONS OF THIS PERIOD.

### A.D. 680-1054.

The ignorance caused by the disorganised condition of society during these ages could not fail to produce many ir-

regularities, abuses and superstitions. I have already alluded to the mischiefs resulting from the use of images, which were of the most afflicting character. The invocation of saints was also frequent, though we do not find that direct prayers were, as yet, addressed to them, or their aid sought, except with a desire for their prayers to God. The litanies of the western Churches began to include such invocations; but they did not find their way into the usual services of the Church. We have seen, in the last chapter, the lamentable want of information on religion which existed in some countries, where the Scriptures and the offices of religion were unintelligible even to the clergy. It was a mistaken reverence for antiquity which led Augustine and Boniface to employ the ancient Latin liturgies in the Churches which they founded amongst the heathen. They had not calculated that the knowledge of that language would be so limited, or that the people would be so badly instructed. Succeeding generations wanted ability or courage to correct a mistake sanctioned by such respectable authority. Still some means of instruction existed, though these were not universally found. Such were the sermons of the bishops and presbyters; the exhortations of the monks; the discipline of penance, which still continued, though much impaired; the system of catechising the young; and the instruction which was conveyed by parents and godfathers, who were also reminded of their duties. And if, as we have reason to believe, a large portion of the community were accustomed to receive the holy eucharist three times a year, we may trust that the state of religion was in those ages not so bad as it has been sometimes represented; and the present age, with all its advantages of civilization, peace, and education, would perhaps scarcely be able to prove its greater attention to known duties, or its more conscientious obedience to the impulse of conscience. As time advanced, indeed, we see the words of our Lord verified. The tares began to grow thickly in the field of the Church, and the wheat was oppressed by their

multitude. The pure gold of the early times, tried seven times in the fire, was now mingled with the alloy of this earth; and the human heart betrayed daily its tendency to fall away from the service of its Creator. The very chosen resorts of religious zeal and self-denying piety exemplified most lamentably this tendency to decay. The way of life in which an Antony and a Benedict had shown such eminent virtues was now filled with lukewarm professors. The simple piety, the poverty, and the industry of St. Benedict's rule, gradually gave way before the influence of too ample endowments. Abuses of all kinds arose. The cupidity of barbarians was attracted by the wealth of monasteries and the splendour of their ornaments. Powerful barons usurped their territories or intruded into their precincts, spreading disorder and licentiousness amongst those former seats of religion and learning. When Odo, about 920, was desirous to devote himself to the monastic life, he went himself or sent messengers to all the celebrated monasteries of France; but he could not find a single house in which sufficent regularity and order were observed. He then founded the monastery and order of Clugny, in which the strictness of ancient discipline was revived. Indeed, the observance of St. Benedict's rule had, even in the preceding century, become so much relaxed, that Benedict of Anianum was employed to *reform* a number of monasteries in France and Italy.

The vast possessions which were bestowed on the Church by the sovereigns of the West, and which were held by feudal tenure, obliged bishops and abbots to attend the courts of princes, to absent themselves from their dioceses, and to mingle in scenes of war and civil commotion, which were little consistent with their sacred characters. Hence too arose that mutual interference of Church and State, of which these ages furnished several examples. Princes seized on the temporalities of churches, kept them vacant to enjoy their revenues, or insisted on the appointment of

bishops who were altogether unworthy. On the other hand, the bishops began to assume temporal authority.* The council of Toledo deposed Wamba, king of the Visigoths, because, as they pretended, he had taken the monastic habit. The emperor Louis le Débonnaire was deposed, and restored again by councils of bishops. When the patriarchs of Rome had obtained from Pepin, Charlemagne, and their successors, considerable grants of territory in Italy, those powerful prelates assumed a still loftier tone of authority, and began to interfere in the disputes and other affairs of princes. Thus Adrian II. forbade the emperor Charles the Bald to possess himself of the dominions of king Lothaire, under pain of excommunication, but in this he was resisted by the bishops of France; and when Gregory IV., about 830, had taken part with Lothaire against his father the emperor Louis, and threatened to excommunicate the latter, the bishops of France informed that prelate, that if he came to excommunicate the emperor, he should return home excommunicated himself.

A.D. 681.

A.D. 833.

Another evil in these times was the facility with which excommunications were denounced. A sentence, which ought only to be passed on those who have been guilty of most serious offences against God or their brethren, was used on many trifling and unworthy occasions; and hence we need not wonder at the complaints frequently made in those times, that excommunication was disregarded.

The power of the Roman see in the western Church was greatly augmented in the ninth century, by the fabrication of a large body of decretal epistles or ecclesiastical laws, which purported to have been written by the popes during the

* [It was clearly through these usurpations of the bishops that the unholy tyranny of Rome grew into being. The episcopal claims were gradually concentered in the one apostolical see of the West; and all the power that the weakness and wickedness of temporal princes had thrown into the hands of the spiritual rulers, was thus drawn to a single focus.—Am Ed.]

first three centuries, and in which the judgment of all bishops, the holding of all councils, and a right to hear appeals from all ecclesiastical judgments, were claimed for the Roman pontiffs. These epistles, which had been forged in the preceding century, and which are now acknowledged by the most learned Romanists to be mere fabrications, exaggerated to the highest degree the powers and privileges of the popes; and the ignorance of the ninth century prevented any discovery of their falsehood. The bishops of Rome asserted their genuineness, and carried their principles into practice; though the bishops, especially those of France, offered much opposition. Thus the liberties of Churches were gradually invaded, while their discipline was injured by the obstacles thrown in the way of assembling synods and condemning offenders, and by the facility of appeals to a foreign and too favourable tribunal.

Nicholas I. A.D. 862.

---

## CHAPTER XV.

### ON THE DIVISIONS OF THE EASTERN AND WESTERN CHURCHES.

### A.D. 680-1054.

During the period now before us the rival Churches of Rome and Constantinople had several disputes. When the controversy about images broke out in the eighth century, Gregory II. and Gregory III. of Rome, excommunicated the emperors of the East, and forbade the payment of tribute to them, in consequence of their opposition to images. The emperors in return confiscated the possessions of the Roman see in their dominions, and withdrawing the various Churches of Illyricum, Macedonia, Greece, as well as those of Sicily, Apulia, and Calabria, from the jurisdiction of Rome, subjected them to the

A.D. 726, 732.

see of Constantinople. The three former provinces had been under the see of Rome for about 350 years; the latter for a much longer time: however, the eastern Church offered no objection to this arrangement, nor was communion interrupted between the East and West on this account, though the bishops of Rome made frequent efforts to obtain a restoration of their authority. Their requests were fruitless, as long as they were addressed to the eastern emperors or Churches; but when the Normans subdued Sicily and Naples, in the eleventh century, those provinces, after an interval of three centuries, again became subject to the Roman jurisdiction. During the disputes on image-worship, the Roman see was for some time separated from the communion of the Church of Constantinople; but it does not appear that the western Church generally regarded either party as heretical, or refused communion with them.

A.D. 1090.

In the ninth century a dispute arose between the bishops of Rome and Constantinople about the province of Bulgaria, which each claimed. This was heightened by the controversy in the case of Photius, who had been made patriarch of Constantinople when Ignatius, the last patriarch, was expelled from his see by the emperor, and deposed by a synod of 318 bishops, by whom Photius was acknowledged patriarch. The Roman see took part with Ignatius, and deposed Photius, who retaliated by deposing the bishop of Rome: but after a time he was expelled, and Ignatius restored by another emperor. The majority of the eastern Church, however, adhered to Photius; and on the death of his rival Ignatius, he was again placed in his see by a synod of 383 bishops, with the approbation of pope John VIII. The latter consented to his restoration, on condition that Bulgaria should be transferred to the Roman jurisdiction; but this transfer was opposed by Photius and his successors; and though he became, in consequence, very obnoxious to the popes, who withdrew their

A.D. 861.

A.D. 879.

communion from him, the communion of the universal Church was not seriously affected, and the two rival Churches afterwards remained in communion till 1054.

In this year, however, a division began between the eastern and western Churches, which has never yet been entirely healed. For when Cerularius, bishop of Constantinople, wrote to the bishop of Trani, in Italy, condemning several of the rites and ceremonies of the Roman Church, and shut up the Latin churches and monasteries at Constantinople, the legate of the Roman see, Cardinal Humbert, insisted on his implicit submission to the pope; and, on his refusal, left an excommunication on the altar of his patriarchal church of St. Sophia at Constantinople. And as the eastern Churches adhered to Cerularius, and the western to the Roman see, they gradually became estranged from each other, though for many ages some communion still existed between them.

I have thus endeavoured to trace briefly the principal features in ecclesiastical history from the beginning to the division of the eastern and western Churches, and to show that in every age the Church of God still existed, notwithstanding all the temptations of the devil, the world, and the flesh. It will next be my endeavour to carry on the same plan from the division of the East and West to the Reformation.

---

## CHAPTER XVI.

### ON THE PROGRESS OF CHRISTIANITY.

### A.D. 1054-1517.

THE period under consideration is chiefly remarkable as exhibiting the progress of the division between the eastern and western Churches, and the rise and increase of the prodigious spiritual and temporal power of the popes. It was the unreasonable claims of this power which separated the

eastern from the western Church, and which still continues to be the great obstacle to their re-union. The spirit of worldliness, of craft, cruelty, and avarice, which so often disgraced professing Christians, and even ministers of Christ, in these ages, was but too faithfully copied from the example of the pretended heads of the universal Church; while the ancient laws and liberties of churches, the rights of kings, and the sound discipline of the Church, were without scruple invaded and subverted by these imperious pontiffs. But we should remember that the visible Church was now becoming co-extensive with the world, and therefore that "it was impossible but that offences should come." The good seed was now mingled thickly with tares, and the love of many waxed faint: but still there was a remnant left; still the Church, however afflicted, might point to new evangelists and saints, and behold the verification of our Saviour's promises.

The great work of evangelising the heathen was continually proceeding, and the zeal and piety of the early missionaries were occasionally revived. In 1124, Boleslaus, duke of Poland, having subjugated the duchy of Pomerania, and wishing to introduce Christianity into that country, invited St. Otto, bishop of Bamberg, to preach the Gospel there, informing him that the people had consented to be baptised, and that he should be aided and assisted in every way by the sovereign power. St. Otto, having learned that the Pomeranians were wealthy and despised poverty, went into that country with a considerable train, and with every thing that could convince the natives that he came not to derive any pecuniary advantage, but solely to win their souls. At the town of Pirits, where they first proceeded, about four thousand men were assembled from all parts to keep the feast of one of their idols. The principal inhabitants of the place were informed by one of the duke's officers of the approach of the bishop, and of the commands of their sovereign, that he should be received and heard with respect. The officer ad

ded, "that this prelate was a great and wealthy man in his own country; that he sought none of their goods, but only their salvation; that they ought to remember their promise to become Christians, and the sufferings they had experienced in war, and not to provoke again the anger of God." After some demur, the pagans, finding that St. Otto was close at hand, agreed to hear him; and the bishop then came with all his company and encamped outside the town, where the barbarians ran in great numbers to behold and assist them. St. Otto then ascended an elevated place, adorned with all his episcopal vestments, and by means of an interpreter addressed the people, who were very eager to hear him.

"May ye be blessed of God," he said, "for the good reception you have given to us. You already know, perhaps, the cause which has brought us so far. It is your salvation and your happiness; for you will be happy for ever, if you will acknowledge your Creator and serve him." While he thus simply exhorted the people, they all declared that they would receive his instructions. He spent seven days in instructing them carefully, with the assistance of his priests and clergy. Then he ordered them to fast three days, to bathe themselves, and clothe themselves with white garments, to be ready for baptism. He then prepared three baptisteries, for the men, women, and children, respectively. These baptisteries were great wooden vessels sunk in the earth and filled with water. They were surrounded by curtains, and at the part of each where the priest stood, was another curtain. When any one was to be baptised, he came accompanied by his godfather, to whom, on entering the baptistery, he gave his garment, and who held it before his face until the ceremony was concluded. The priest, as soon as he observed any one in the water, drew aside the curtain a little, and baptised him, immersing his head three times in the water. He then anointed him with chrism, gave him a white garment, and dismissed him. The godfather received him, covered him

with his garment, and led him away. In winter, baptism was administered with warm water, in places well heated.

Otto and his companions remained three weeks at Pirits, instructing the converts in the duties of religion, the observance of Sundays and holy days; exhorting them to attend the celebration of the eucharist, and to communicate at least three or four times in the year. He explained to them the sacraments, desired that their children should be brought for baptism at Easter and Whitsuntide, exhorted them to give some of their children to be educated as clergy, and left them a priest to administer the sacraments, whom these people, to the number of seven thousand, received with the greatest joy and devotion.

In the next town he remained six weeks, and baptised so great a multitude, that his alb was often wet with perspiration even to the waist. At another town he was less fortunate. The pagans fell with fury on him and his attendants. St. Otto was with difficulty saved, after having received many blows and fallen in the mud. At Stetten, the people declared at first that they were satisfied with their old religion, and refused to become Christians; but they afterwards gave hopes that if the duke would remit certain taxes, they might be induced to adopt Christianity. While the negotiation was going on, the bishop and priests, arrayed in their vestments, and bearing a cross, preached twice a week in the market-place, that is, on market-days. The novelty attracted many hearers, and several were converted. On the return of their messengers with a favourable answer from the duke, the inhabitants resolved to receive the Gospel. Otto exhorted them to destroy their idols; but as they feared to do so, he himself led the way with his clergy, and struck the idols down, when the people, seeing that their gods could not avenge themselves, completed the work of destruction. Thus he went throughout Pomerania, converting multitudes of the people, and at length returned to Bamberg, after a year's absence. In a few years he again visited Pomerania, many

of the people having relapsed into paganism; but as he approached Stettin, the clergy who accompanied him, dreading the barbarity of the people, remonstrated with him, and endeavoured to dissuade him from his journey. He said to them, "I would fain exhort you to martyrdom, but I shall not constrain any one. If you will not aid me, at least do not hinder me; but leave to me the same liberty which I do to you." Thus saying, he shut himself up in his chamber, and remained in prayer till the evening. But in the night he placed on his shoulders a bag containing his vestments and the vessels of the altar, and privately left the place, taking the road to Stettin, and chanting the nocturnal service as he went. Early in the morning, the clergy found him, after an anxious search, as he was entering a boat; and casting themselves at his feet, with many tears, promised that they would follow him even to death. St. Otto succeeded in recovering the people from their apostacy, and after many labours and dangers returned at last to Bamberg.

In 1168, the natives of the Isle of Rugen, in the Baltic, were converted to Christianity; the capital of that island having been surrendered to Waldemar, king of Denmark, on condition that the idol Suantovit, and all his treasure, should be delivered to the king, and that the people should embrace the Christian religion. Suantovit, whom these barbarians regarded as their principal deity, was originally the martyr St. Vitus. The monks of Corby, in Saxony, had formerly introduced Christianity into this island, and they had dwelt so much on the merits and miracles of this saint (whose relics were preserved at Corby,) that the people, after their departure, fell into most dreadful idolatry, forgot the true God, and placed the martyr St. Vitus, whom they called Suantovit, in his stead, and made an idol of the saint with four heads, to which the people offered human sacrifices; and the idol priest had greater wealth and authority than the king. Such are the dangers which arise from the excessive honours paid to saints and images. The idol was

dragged into the Danish camp, where it was split to pieces, and the wood was employed in the camp kitchens. The idol temple was burnt, churches were built, and the people converted and baptised by the bishops of Roskild and Mecklenberg, who accompanied the king of Denmark.

The Sclavonians who inhabited the borders of the Baltic sea were, in a great measure, converted by the pious and judicious zeal of Vicelin, bishop of Oldenberg. A.D. 1124-1154. He devoted thirty years of his life to the glorious work of an evangelist among the northern nations, and few names in these ages deserve more reverence.

About the same time, the Armenians, who had been for a long time involved in the Eutychian heresy, condemned by the fourth œcumenical synod, were re-united for a time to the communion of the patriarch of Constantinople. In the following century they also received for a short time the dominion of the bishop of Rome.

The conversion of the Maronites, a small nation of Mount Lebanon, in Syria, took place about 1182. They had been involved in the Monothelite heresy since the seventh century; but now, finding themselves surrounded by the various principalities established by the Latins in the time of the crusades, they embraced the faith, discipline, and obedience of the pope. About this time, the Gospel was introduced into Livonia, a country on the Baltic, by Meinard, A.D. 1186. canon of Sigeburg, who made several voyages there with the merchants, and gained many converts. Finding his work prosperous, he applied to the archbishop of Bremen for additional authority, and was ordained bishop, when he fixed his see at Riga, and converted great numbers of the heathen. Berno, bishop of Suerin, who died in 1195, had also baptised many of the Sclavonians, abolished their idols, and cut down their groves.

In 1210, some Cistertian monks preached the Gospel in Prussia; and some years afterwards, the pagans of that country having most dreadfully persecuted the Christian

converts, they were subdued by Crusaders, and by the powerful order of Teutonic knights, and gradually converted to Christianity. In this century also, the Mohammedans were deprived of their dominion in the greater part of Spain, and Christianity was re-established in that country. They had already been despoiled of Sicily by the Normans. In 1230, the king and people of Courland, on the Baltic sea, made a treaty with the Roman legate in Germany, by which they undertook to receive the Gospel. The Franciscan and Dominican friars, in the latter part of this century, preached in Tartary with considerable success. They were sent by Nicholas IV. with letters to the emperor of Tartary, and to the Nestorians; and they succeeded in erecting several Christian churches in China, which was then under the dominion of the Tartars. One of these pious missionaries, named John à Monte Corvino, translated the Psalms and the New Testament into the Tartar language. In 1307, 1311, and 1338, Clement V. and Benedict XII. sent several bishops into Tartary and China; but after that period their missions seem to have fallen into decay. The last country in Europe which received the Christian religion was Lithuania. Jagello, duke of Lithuania, was still a pagan, when, on the death of Louis, king of Poland, he was named amongst the candidates for the vacant throne; but his infidelity was an invincible obstacle to the attainment of his wishes. It is to be hoped that his conversion was sincere, as he persuaded all his subjects to embrace Christianity, at the same time that he himself did, in 1386.

A.D. 1292.

The conquests of the Portuguese in Africa and India led to the spread of Christianity in those countries. The sovereigns of that nation felt themselves bound to use all their influence for the propagation of the Gospel in their dominions; and the first result was the conversion of the king and people of Congo in Africa, in 1491. The subsequent settlement of the Portuguese in India was distinguished by similar blessings. The conquest of South America and of the

West Indies, by the Spaniards, was also made the means of disseminating the Christian faith through those wide regions, though we cannot but deplore the cruelties which were practised in the subjugation of the unfortunate inhabitants of those countries.

---

## CHAPTER XVII.

### ON THE FAITH OF THE CHURCH.

### A.D. 1054-1517.

THE belief of the eastern and western branches of the universal Church remained the same in all articles of faith, during the period now before us, as it had been before the division. The Nicene creed was universally received as the rule of faith. The six holy œcumenical synods were still regarded with the greatest veneration; but the decrees of the Nicene synod in favour of images, which pretended to be the seventh œcumenical synod, were only approved by the eastern and by a portion of the western Churches. The principal point of doctrinal difference between the East and West, was the procession of the Holy Spirit; for the former asserted, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father only, while the latter believed that He also proceeds from the Son. However, as the former allowed that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *by* the Son, the difference did not seem irreconcilable. The doctrine of purgatory, which was held by the popes, and a large party in the West, as an article of faith, was another point of dissension between them and the Greek Church, by which this doctrine was constantly denied. With the exception of these points, there was no difference in matters of faith between the East and West. The doctrines of the Trinity, incarnation, divinity of our Lord, the atonement, original sin, and the need of divine grace;

the obligation of good works, of repentance, prayer, fasting, alms-giving, charity, and all other Christian acts and habits, were universally maintained. The faith of the western Church is shown by its condemnation of various heretics, such as Peter de Bruis and Arnold of Brescia, who, in the twelfth century, denied infant baptism, and destroyed churches. The Albigenses, who held Manichæan heresies, were condemned in several councils, especially the great Lateran synod, in 1216, which, in opposition to their errors, made a definition of faith in the Triune God, the only Principle and Author of all things; the authority of the Old Testament; our Lord's incarnation, suffering, bodily ascension into heaven; the resurrection of the body at the last day; the importance of the eucharist, and the real presence of Christ's body and blood; the necessity of baptism, and lawfulness of marriage. The Manichæans denied all this: and the decree furnishes a clear proof that the western Church always maintained its ancient faith. During the period now under consideration, all the most eminent and learned theologians of the western Church continued to believe that man cannot merit salvation by his own works, but that he must place his whole trust and confidence in the mercy of God, and the atonement, merits, and intercession of our Lord Jesus Christ. It has been shown by a learned writer (Archbishop Usher,[1]) that this truly Christian doctrine was included amongst the instructions and consolations which were prescribed for the use of persons ready to depart from this life. Amongst other questions which were to be put to the sick man, were the following: "Dost thou believe to come to glory, not by thine own merits, but by the virtue and merit of the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ?" and, "Dost thou believe that our Lord Jesus Christ did die for our salvation, and that none can be saved by his own merits, or by any other means but by the merit of his passion?" In other copies of the same office for visiting the sick, the last question is this:

[1] Usher, Answer to a Jesuit, ch. xii.

"Dost thou believe that thou canst not be saved but by the death of Christ?" And when the sick person has replied in the affirmative, he is exhorted in these words: "Come, therefore, while thy soul remaineth in thee, place thy whole confidence in this death alone; have confidence in no other thing; commit thyself wholly to this death; with this alone cover thyself wholly; mingle thyself entirely in it, fasten thyself in it, wrap thyself wholly in it. And if the Lord will judge thee, say, Lord, I oppose the death of our Lord Jesus Christ betwixt me and thy judgment; no otherwise do I contend with thee. And if he say unto thee, that thou art a sinner, say, Lord, I put the death of the Lord Jesus Christ betwixt thee and my sins. If he say unto thee, that thou hast deserved damnation, say, Lord, I set the death of our Lord Jesus Christ betwixt me and my bad merits; and I offer his merit instead of the merit which I ought to have, but yet have not. If he say, that he is angry with thee, say, Lord, I interpose the death of our Lord Jesus Christ betwixt me and thine anger."

Such was the belief and such the practice of the Latin Churches, in ages when great corruptions had undoubtedly become prevalent; and surely it is impossible to trace such sentiments, without a feeling of gratitude to that GOD, who, in spite of so many scandals, so much ignorance, and such heavy sins, still continued to fulfil his gracious promises, and to preserve always in his Church those vital truths, which constitute the only solid foundation for a Christian's hope of salvation. It would be easy to trace the same doctrine in the writings of St. Bernard, St. Anselm, Petrus Blesensis, and many of the most eminent scholastic writers of the middle ages. But at length ignorant and wicked men maintained that our "good works are properly *meritorious*, and the very *cause* of salvation; so far that God would be *unjust*, if he rendered not heaven for the same." These arrogant sentiments were held by some of the Romish controversialists

in the sixteenth century; but they had been for some time before slowly working their way in the Church.

The Roman pontiffs regarded their own supremacy over the whole Church, by divine right, as a prime article of faith; and their adherents, the monks, friars, and schoolmen, maintained it so vigorously, that in this period it came to be regarded generally in the western Church as a matter of faith, or at least as a settled and indisputable point. On this basis the fabric of the papal power was raised to a gigantic height. As for the eastern Churches, they rejected and denied this novel doctrine, which was never declared to be an article of faith by any general synod; for the synod of Lyons, in which this doctrine was advanced by the ambassadors of the Greek emperor, to gratify the pope, and by some Greek bishops who acted under intimidation; and the synod of Florence, in which it was forced on those Greek bishops who were present, were rejected by the eastern Church. The latter synod, indeed, was of doubtful authority, even in the West, as it consisted only of Italian bishops, while the rival synod of Basle was sitting at the same time. The doctrine, however, became deeply rooted throughout the western or Latin Churches.

A.D. 1274.

A.D. 1439.

The synod of Florence, just referred to, was the first synod which taught the doctrine of purgatory as an article of faith. It had, indeed, been held by the popes, and by many writers; and it became the popular doctrine during the period under review; but it was not decreed by any authority of the universal, or even the whole Latin Church. In the eastern Church it was always rejected.

Nearly the same may be said of transubstantiation; for though the popular persuasion, and that of the majority of the schoolmen, was, that after consecration the bread of the eucharist no longer exists, there were several learned men during these ages who held different notions, such as Durand, and many others mentioned by Cardinal D'Ailly.

The council of Lateran, indeed, had made use of the *word* "transubstantiation," to express the change by which the bread and wine become the sacrament of Christ's body and blood; but this word might be, and in fact was, used in many senses inconsistent with the Romish interpretation of it; and the object of the synod itself seems to have been merely to establish the old doctrine of the presence and reception of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament, in opposition to the Manichæan errors. The eastern Church in these ages knew nothing of transubstantiation. Such in general was the condition of the Christian faith up to the beginning of the Reformation. No article of faith was denied by the Church generally; the erroneous doctrines which existed were held by a greater or less number of individuals, but without any solemn decree or determination of the universal Church. Errors not directly contrary to the articles of faith may occasionally exist in the Church, because they do not destroy its faith. Even the Roman Catholic theologian Bossuet says, that the majority of writers in any age may suppose some doctrine to be a matter of faith which is not really so; and other Roman theologians allow, that the opinion most commonly held at any time in the Church may not be true. The promises of our Saviour to his Church only extend to the preservation of the articles of the faith, all of which were revealed by himself and the apostles, and are written in Holy Scripture. A.D. 1215.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

### ON THE FRUITS OF FAITH.

### A.D. 1054-1517.

I HAVE already adverted to the pious labours of evangelists and missionaries during these ages: it now remains to speak of some of the most eminent saints who adorned

the Church; and I shall commence with some account of ST. ANSELM. He was born in Piedmont, of noble parents, about A.D. 1033, and was brought up by his pious mother in the ways of godliness. When he was about fifteen years of age he wished to enter the monastic state, but was refused by the abbot to whom he applied, for fear of his parents' displeasure. During the course of his studies after this time, he neglected to cultivate the spirit of religion in his heart; and having lost his zeal for piety, and becoming insensible to the fatal tendency of vanity and worldly pleasures, he began to walk in the broad way of worldliness. Anselm in his writings expresses the deepest sorrow and contrition for these disorders of his early life, which he never ceased most bitterly to deplore to the end of his days.

After several years of diligent study in France and Burgundy, he was attracted by the great celebrity of Lanfranc, prior of Bec in Normandy, and afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, to place himself under his tuition. After some years, Anselm reverted to his early design, embraced the monastic state, and became successor to Lanfranc's office and celebrity. He applied himself most earnestly to every part of theology by the clear light of Scripture and tradition, and acquired great fame by his theological writings, his skill in metaphysics, and his ability in teaching, which attracted multitudes of disciples from all the adjoining kingdoms to the monastery of Bec. In 1078 he was elected abbot of Bec; and as that house possessed lands in England, he was occasionally obliged to visit this country, where he was held in the highest esteem by William the Conqueror, by Lanfranc, now archbishop of Canterbury, and by many great nobles in the kingdom.

A.D. 1089. On the death of Lanfranc, the possessions of his see, like those of several others, were seized by king William Rufus, who kept many of the English bishoprics vacant for years, and applied their revenues to his own use. At length, having fallen into a dangerous

illness, and apprehending that his end was near, he was touched with compunction for his ill-spent life, and endeavoured to make amends for his sins, by issuing proclamations for the release of prisoners, the discharge of debts due to him, and a general pardon; and at the same time he nominated Anselm, who happened to be at the court, to the metropolitan see of Canterbury, which, notwithstanding the strongest opposition on his part, Anselm was obliged at last to accept, and he was soon after consecrated with great solemnity. A.D. 1093.

It may be here observed, that the pope had not yet acquired the power of appointing to bishoprics in England. Anselm was elected and consecrated archbishop of Canterbury without any papal bulls. It was after this that the pope sent him the pall, which constituted him vicar of the Roman see.

Anselm was soon exposed to the enmity of the wicked prince who had, in a moment of transitory remorse, advanced him to the highest office in the Church of England. His refusal to pay the king an immense sum, which was demanded for his nomination to the archbishopric; and his persevering solicitations for the removal of gross corruptions in ecclesiastical patronage, and for permission to hold synods with a view to enforce the discipline of the Church, excited the wrath of the tyrant, who resorted to every possible expedient in the hopes of depriving him of his bishopric. At length, unwilling to witness grievous oppressions of religion, which he was unable to prevent, Anselm retired to France, and thence to Rome, where he earnestly wished to resign his see, but was prevented by pope Urban II., who enjoined him to retain his office, and to maintain the cause of the Church. He was received with great honours in all parts of Italy, and assisted at the council of Bari, where a conference took place between the oriental and the Latin Churches, and where Anselm was commissioned to argue against the doctrine of the Greeks on the procession A.D. 1098.

of the Holy Spirit. After the death of William Rufus, he returned to England, and was received with much friendship by king Henry I.; but this harmony was ere long interrupted by demands of homage and investiture on the part of the king, which Anselm, in accordance with certain principles lately laid down by a synod at Rome, thought it his duty to refuse. Notwithstanding this, he opposed himself with all his power to an attempt made by Robert duke of Normandy to obtain the crown of England; and Henry I. was much indebted to him for retaining possession of his throne. After many other troubles, this venerable man died peaceably at Canterbury in 1109.

St. Anselm had a most lively faith in all the great truths of the Christian religion. His hope of heavenly things gave him a great contempt for the vanities of the world; and he might truly say, that he was dead to the world and to all its desires. By the habitual restraints he imposed on his appetite, he seemed to have attained perfect indifference to the nourishment which he took. His fortitude was such, that neither fear nor favour could ever induce him to swerve from the way of justice and of truth. He seemed to live not for himself, but for others. Amidst all his troubles and public distractions, prayer was his great and continual resource. He often retired in the day to his devotions, and not unfrequently continued the whole night in prayer. An anecdote has been preserved, which shows how continually his mind was engaged on the great and awful realities of religion. One day as he was riding, at one of his manors, a hare, pursued by the hounds, ran under his horse for refuge; on which he stopped, and the hounds stood at bay. The hunters began to laugh at this circumstance; but Anselm said, weeping, "This hare reminds me of a poor sinner just upon the point of departing this life, surrounded by devils waiting to carry away their prey." The hare going off, he forbade her to be pursued, and was obeyed. In this manner, every circumstance served to raise his mind to God; and, in the

midst of noise and tumult he enjoyed all that tranquillity and peace which naturally arose from the continual contemplation of his God and Saviour, and which elevated him above the cares and anxieties of this life.

St. Bernard was born in France in 1091, the third of six brothers, and was remarkable in his childhood for diligence in his studies, and for the purity of his morals. When he had attained his twenty-second year, finding himself surrounded by the temptations of the world, he resolved to follow the example of Antony, and to seek a retreat in the newly-founded monastery of Citeaux; and he persuaded his five brothers, his uncle, and many other persons of wealth and merit, to unite with him. Accompanied by thirty disciples, he was admitted at Citeaux, where he sought to hide himself from the world; and so entirely was he absorbed in the contemplation of heavenly things, that all the ordinary affairs and objects of life ceased to excite his attention or curiosity. His watchings and fastings brought on an infirmity of body, which never left him. In accordance with the rule of St. Benedict, which was here strictly observed, he laboured diligently with his hands, while at the same time he was inwardly occupied in the worship of God. He prayed and meditated on Scripture, and afterwards said that it was chiefly in the woods and fields that he had learned the spiritual meaning of holy writ. In the intervals of labour, he was always engaged in prayer, reading, or meditation. He studied Scripture by simply reading it regularly through many times; and said that there was nothing which enabled him to understand it better than its own words, and that all its truths had more force in the text than in the discourses of commentators. He, however, read, with humility, the expositions of the fathers, and followed in their footsteps.

After St. Bernard had been a year at Citeaux, he was sent, by the abbot, to take charge of the new monastery at Clairvaux. The society began in extreme poverty. They were often obliged to make their pottage of leaves, and mingle

their bread with millet and vetches. Assistance, however, came to them often when it was least expected. St. Bernard proposed to his disciples in this place a piety so pure and elevated, that it seemed beyond them; but his exalted sentiments, and the strictness of his discipline, gradually produced a revival of the ascetic life in all its purity. On approaching Clairvaux a different scene presented itself from that afforded by other monasteries, which were magnificently built and adorned, and exhibited every sign of opulence. The buildings here were plain and poor. The valley was filled with men, each silently engaged in his appointed task; and nothing interrupted the silence, but the sound of labour, or the praise of God when the monks chanted their offices. They lived on the poorest fare, and denied themselves all earthly pleasures and enjoyments.

The fame of St. Bernard soon spread far and wide, and men began to resort to him; but wherever he was, or with whomsoever conversing, he could not refrain from preaching and speaking of the blessed truths of religion, and of his God and Saviour. His zeal, the extent of his learning, the acuteness of his intellect, his dauntless courage, and a piety which shed the splendour of sanctity over all his great endowments, soon distinguished him as a man who was calculated for a wider sphere than the limits of his cloister afforded; and for the last thirty years of his life (he died in 1153,) St. Bernard was consulted by popes, emperors, kings, and bishops. He was engaged in most affairs of importance; was called to many councils; subdued several heretics in controversy; was commissioned to preach the crusade to the assembled sovereign and nobles of France; influenced the Christian world in favour of pope Innocent, whose election he supported against a rival; lived to see one of his own monks placed on the papal throne; and at his death left a hundred and sixty monasteries, who regarded him as their founder or their governor.

A.D. 1130.

At Cremona, in Italy, about this time, lived a man named

HOMOBONUS, who was a merchant, and remarkable for honesty in all his dealings. He was married: but finding himself more free to follow his wishes after the death of his father, he resolved to labour no more for the wealth of this world, but to give himself up to prayer, watchfulness, fasting, and other religious duties. He distributed to the poor what he had gained in traffic, and performed every office of charity both to their souls and bodies. His wife reproached him with his want of care for the things of this life; but he calmly reminded her, that what is given to God is never lost. He often went at night to pray in the church; and one morning early, while the service was proceeding, he prostrated himself on the ground, his hands extended in the form of a cross, and after a time he was found to be dead. He died in 1197.

Some of the most learned and pious of the schoolmen flourished in the thirteenth century. Amongst these may be named PETER LOMBARD, ALEXANDER DE HALES, BONAVENTURA, AQUINAS, and SCOTUS. These were men of very ardent piety; but some of them were deeply tinged with superstition. The founder of the order of Franciscan friars was also endued with a zealous spirit of religion. ST. FRANCIS, amidst much enthusiasm, displayed a spirit of devotion and piety, a contempt for all earthly things, and a simplicity of purpose in the endeavour to win souls to God, which reflect honour on his memory. But it is to be lamented, that the spirit of credulity, if not of imposture, has been so largely at work in attributing to him a mass of fabulous miracles, some of which have excited derision in later times, as they did even in the thirteenth century. A.D. 1182-1226.

RICHARD, ordained bishop of Chichester in 1245, affords an example of piety and charity. After his consecration, king Henry III. withheld the revenues of his see; so that he was obliged to depend on the charity of those of the people of his diocese who were willing to minister to his necessities; but he, nevertheless, made visitations, and adminis-

tered the sacraments, as he saw need. At length, after enduring the deprivation of his lands with patience, they were restored to him by the king, but in a miserable state, and plundered of every thing. He, however, began to distribute abundant alms; and when his brother, who managed his affairs, represented that his revenue was insufficient, he replied: "Is it right that we should eat off gold and silver, while Jesus Christ suffers hunger in the persons of his poor? I know how to content myself with earthen vessels, as my father did. Let every thing be sold, even to my horse, if there be need." He was fervent in prayer, in fasting, and all good works.

He never gave benefices to his relatives; he resisted, with invincible firmness, the king and the archbishop of Canterbury, who wanted him to prefer an unworthy curate in his diocese. He preached assiduously, even out of his diocese; consoled and encouraged those penitents who came to consult him as their spiritual adviser; and died, in 1253, as he was engaged in the active and diligent discharge of his sacred duties.

Robert Grosteste, bishop of Lincoln, who flourished at the same time, was remarkable for sanctity of life, and purity and severity of discipline. He opposed himself, with remarkable firmness, to the exactions and pretensions of the popes. On one occasion, when he had received a mandate from the pope to appoint an improper person to a benefice in his diocese, he wrote in reply, that the mandate he had received could not be genuine, as it pretended to the power of subverting all the canons, and as it prescribed a positive sin, in requiring the introduction of a false pastor into the Church. The pope was very much irritated, and threatened to have him punished by the king of England; but the cardinals represented that this prelate's reputation stood so high in France and England, that no remedy could be hoped for. Grosteste complained of the pretension of the popes to dispense with all the canons and constitutions of the Church at

pleasure; of their ordering the Dominican and Franciscan friars to persuade the dying to leave their goods to the crusade, and to take the cross themselves, in order to defraud their heirs of their goods, and to enrich the papal coffers; of their measuring indulgences in proportion to the money given for the crusade; of their ordering bishops to institute to benefices persons who were foreigners, ignorant, or absent; of their permitting persons to be bishops* without ordination, in order that they might enjoy the revenues of the Church; and of the general avarice, extortion, and impurity, which reigned in the court of Rome. Grosteste is said to have performed miracles; but, though adorned with many virtues, his resistance to the Church of Rome prevented his ever being numbered amongst the saints of that calendar.

The most eminent theologians in the following centuries were Ockham, an English ecclesiastic, who refuted the doctrine of the infallibility of the pope; Nicholas de Lyra, who wrote a commentary on Scripture, which was much valued by the Reformers; Gerson; and Peter D'Ailly, who, in the fifteenth century, argued against the papal pretensions, and ably defended the rights of the Church. Gerson was a man of eminent piety, and wrote many devotional treatises. The celebrated book "Of the Imitation of Christ," which was written in the fifteenth century by Thomas a Kempis, a canon in Germany, is a sufficient proof that Christian faith and devotion of the highest order were still existing in the Church.

about A.D. 1325.

A.D. 1293-1330.

A.D. 1363-1429.

There cannot be a stronger exemplification of this consolatory truth than in the life of Laurence Justiniani, bishop and patriarch of Venice.

This venerable man, whose excellent piety and abundant

* [That is, to hold the sees; the spiritual functions were performed, if attended to at all, by vicars, consecrated bishops *in partibus infidelium*, as Romish coadjutor-bishops now are.—Am. Ed.]

good works were worthy of the brightest ages of the Church, was born in Venice in 1389, of a noble and ancient family; and at nineteen years of age devoted himself to the monastic life in his native place, where he was remarkable for prayer, fasting, and vigils, and for the fervour and zeal of his piety. He was endued with a remarkable spirit of Christian fortitude; and being afflicted with an illness which rendered a surgical operation indispensable, he said to his surgeons, who trembled at the danger to which his life was exposed, "What do you fear? Let the razors and the burning irons be brought in. Cannot He grant me constancy, who not only supported but even preserved from the flames the three children?" On another similar occasion he said to a surgeon, "Your razor cannot exceed the burning irons of the martyrs."

While he resided in the monastery, he was remarkable for his humility: he willingly undertook the lowest and most menial offices in his community, and evinced a spirit of poverty and self-denial which the most eminent ascetics might have applauded. After some time, he was ordained priest, and became general, or superior of his order, which he reformed and regulated with so much strictness, that he was afterwards regarded as its second founder. The saying of our Lord, that "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh," was verified in this holy man. All his conversation was replete with a spirit of piety, which melted the hearts of those with whom he discoursed. His confidence in the infinite power and goodness of God kept pace with a perfect humility and distrust of himself; and assiduous prayer was his continual support.

In 1433 he was made bishop of Venice, which was afterwards, in honour to his transcendent merits, made a patriarchal see by the pope. He endeavoured ineffectually to decline this appointment; and being exceedingly averse to pomp and ostentation, he took possession of his church so

privately that his friends knew nothing of the matter till the ceremony was over.

When he was placed at the head of so great a church, his manners and habits of life experienced no alteration. His household was placed on the most moderate scale; it consisted only of five persons. He had no plate in his house, but used only earthen ware, lay on a straw bed, and wore no rich clothing. His example, his severity towards himself, and his affability and kindness to others, won the hearts of all, and enabled him to introduce most important reforms in discipline. Great multitudes of people resorted every day to his palace for advice, comfort, or alms. His gate, provisions, and purse, were always open to the poor. His alms were carefully and judiciously distributed; provisions and clothing were more frequently given to applicants than money. With a feeling of the most considerate sympathy, he employed pious matrons to find out and relieve those poor whose modesty prevented them from soliciting alms, and to assist persons of family in decayed circumstances. These abundant charities were but the result of a spirit of divine love, which influenced all his conduct. Nothing could exceed his zeal for the glory of God; and he was rewarded by the gift of wisdom, which enabled him to pacify most violent dissensions in the state, and to govern his diocese in most difficult times with perfect ease.

In his last illness, his servants were preparing a bed for him, at which this self-denying man was troubled, and said to them, "Are you laying a feather-bed for me? No, that shall not be; my Lord was stretched on a hard and painful tree. Do not you remember what St. Martin said in his agony, that a Christian ought to die on sack-cloth and ashes?" He forbade his friends to weep for him; and as his strength failed, often exclaimed, with rapture, "Behold the Bridegroom; let us go forth and meet him." He added, with his eyes raised towards heaven, "Good Jesus, behold, I come." When it was remarked to him, that he might go

joyfully to his crown, he was much disturbed, and said, "The crown is for valiant soldiers, not for base cowards such as I am." During the two last days of his life, all the city came in turn, according to their ranks, to receive his blessing. He commanded even the beggars to be admitted; and addressed to every class some short pathetic instructions; after which he departed in peace, in the year 1455. Such examples suffice to show, that even when the Church was most in need of reformation, the grace of God still continued to produce saving faith, and to sanctify his people.

That serious corruptions in practice, and even in doctrine, had now become common among Christians, is indeed but too evident. Learned and godly men were longing for a reformation of the many evils by which religion was afflicted: but amidst much of human infirmity and sin, we still cannot avoid recognizing the continued fulfilment of the promises of God to his Church. The following expressions of Luther on this subject are well worthy of attention. "In this Church," he says, "God miraculously and powerfully preserved baptism; moreover, in the public pulpits, and the Lord's day sermons, he preserved the text of the Gospel in the language of every nation, besides remission of sins, and absolution as well in confession as in public. Again, the sacrament of the altar, which at Easter, and twice or three times in the year, they offered to Christians, although they administered only one kind (*i. e.* the bread.) Again, calling and ordination to parishes, and the ministry of the word, the keys to bind and loose, and to comfort in the agony of death. For amongst many it was customary to show the image of Christ crucified to those who were dying, and admonish them of his death and blood. Then, by a Divine miracle, there remained in the Church the Psalter, the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, the Ten Commandments. Likewise many pious and excellent hymns, which were left to posterity by truly Christian and spiritual men, though oppressed with tyranny. Wherever were these truly sacred relics—the relics of holy

men—there was and is the true holy Church of Christ, for all these are ordinances and fruits of Christ; except the forcible removal of one part of the sacrament from Christians. In this Church of Christ, therefore, the Spirit of Christ was certainly present, and preserved true knowledge and true faith in his elect."

---

## CHAPTER XIX.

### ON THE EASTERN CHURCH.

### A.D. 1054-1517.

THE eastern or Greek Church existed under the Greek emperors, in the country now called Turkey in Europe and Asia Minor, and also in Russia, Poland, Bulgaria, Moravia, Sclavonia, Georgia, Mingrelia, Circassia, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt. It was governed by the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. After the division between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople, the eastern and western Churches did not immediately withdraw from mutual communion. In 1155, Basil, archbishop of Thessalonica, in an epistle to Adrian IV., allowed that the Latin Churches held the orthodox faith, and formed part of the universal Church, while he denied that the Greek Church was guilty of schism: and in 1203, Demetrius, archbishop of Bulgaria, denied that the Latins were heretics. On the other hand, Peter, abbot of Clugny, and William of Tyre, in the twelfth century, admitted the Greeks to form part of the Catholic Church; and several modes of intercourse existed between the Churches. The popes, however, being full of the notion of their own supremacy over the whole Church, always treated the Greeks as schismatics; and though they entered into many negotiations with the Greek emperors, for the re-union of East and

A.D. 1054.

West, the first article always insisted on was, that the Greek Church should *obey* the pope. Had the popes merely desired to restore the communion of the Churches, leaving the Greeks their ancient independence and equality, there would have been no difficulty; but they refused, and rightly refused, to place their religion, their discipline, their property and persons, at the feet of pontiffs who pretended to infallibility, and who refused to be bound by any laws or canons.*

The views of the eastern Church on this subject are exemplified by the words of Nechites, archbishop of Nicomedia, in his conference with a Latin bishop: "We do not refuse the Roman Church," he said, "the first rank among her sisters the patriarchal Churches, and we acknowledge that she presides in a general council; but she separated from us by her pride, when, exceeding her power, she divided the empire and the Churches of the East and West. When she holds a council of western bishops without us, it is well that they should observe their own decrees; but how can we be expected to obey decrees made without our knowledge? If the pope pretends to send us his orders, fulminating from his lofty throne, and to dispose of us and our churches at his own discretion, without advising with us, what paternity or what fraternity is there in that? We should be only slaves, not children of the Church. The Roman Church alone would enjoy liberty, and give laws to all others, without being subject to any herself. We do not find in any creed, that we are bound to confess the Roman Church in particular, but one holy, catholic, and apostolic Church. This is what I say of the Roman Church, which I revere with you; but I do not with you believe it a duty to follow her necessarily in all things, nor that we ought to relinquish our

A.D. 1137.

* [It ought not to be overlooked, how the providence of God thus made the Roman attempts at usurpation provide an insuperable bar to the subsequent claim of catholicity for Romish corruptions in doctrine and practice. The latter *might* have become universal, but for the jealous hostility awakened by the former.—Am. Ed.]

rites, and adopt her mode of performing the sacraments, without examining it by reason and the Scriptures."

The crusades which the popes set on foot for the recovery of the Holy Land, but which led to the subjugation of Constantinople, Cyprus, and a great part of the Greek empire, by Latin chieftains, tended much to promote unfriendly feelings between the Churches. Latin bishops were instituted in Jerusalem, Antioch, Constantinople, Greece, Cyprus, although there were already Greek bishops in those sees; and the Crusaders in many places profaned the Greek Churches, expelled their clergy, or forced them, on pain of death, to become obedient to Rome. The Greeks retaliated when they were able; and the Churches became much more estranged from each other.

In the year 1261, the Greek emperor Michael Paleologus recovered Constantinople from the Latins; and fearing that the pope would proclaim a crusade against him, he entered into negociations for the union of the Churches, and compelled some of the Greek bishops to write to the pope and the council of Lyons, admitting the primacy of the Roman see, and expressing their wish for union. A letter from the emperor was also read in the council, in which he professed his belief in the Roman primacy, in purgatory, transubstantiation, and seven sacraments, as the pope had commanded. The council then permitted the re-union of the Greek Church to the Latin, and did not require any alteration in their form of worship. But in 1280 the pope again excommunicated the Greeks for not obeying his commands, and the temporary union came to an end. When Constantinople was threatened by the Turks, in the fifteenth century, the Greek emperor John Paleologus, desirous of obtaining the pope's assistance for his falling empire, came with several Greek bishops to the synod of Florence, where, after much disputation, those prelates were compelled to subscribe to the doctrine of purgatory, the papal primacy, and the procession of

A.D. 1274.

A.D. 1438.

the Holy Spirit as held by the Roman Church: but on their return to Greece, they were condemned by the eastern Church, and the proposed union fell to the ground. Constantinople was taken by the Turks in 1453; and the Christians of those countries have been ever since much oppressed by these infidels: but the popes discovered that the attempt to reduce the Greek Church beneath their sway was a hopeless one.

## CHAPTER XX.

### ABUSES AND CORRUPTIONS.

### A.D. 1054-1517.

THE grand and crying evil of these ages was the position of the Roman pontiffs, who were now exalted in the western Church to such a height of power, and invested by themselves and their adherents with such extravagant privileges, that the temporal as well as spiritual governments throughout Europe were every where agitated and enslaved, and the rights of sovereigns, the liberties of Churches, the holiest discipline of antiquity, were ruthlessly invaded and subverted. The spirit of the world discovered itself in the proceedings of the court of Rome; and ambition, cupidity, and pride, were but too frequently the characteristics of the Roman pontiffs. These evils were the result of false maxims. The flatterers of the popes had, for several ages before those now under consideration, attributed too extensive powers to them. It had become a settled notion in the western Churches, that the bishops of Rome were the successors of St. Peter in the primacy of the Church by *divine appointment*. The spurious decretals, already alluded to, represented them as, even from the time of the apostles, claiming and exercising an extended jurisdiction over all Churches. Hence it followed neces-

sarily that it was the duty of every Church and every Christian to be in communion with, and to be subject to, the pope; and therefore that those who were out of his communion, or disobedient to him, were not Christian. This was, in fact, to invest the Roman pontiff with absolute power in temporal as well as spiritual matters; for if, as it was maintained, it was absolutely necessary for every Christian to be in his communion, the only thing requisite to obtain obedience, whether from kings or bishops, was to threaten or inflict excommunication upon them. Sooner or later this formidable sentence was pretty sure to weigh upon the consciences of those who were disobedient to the papal commands, or on those of their adherents; so that these prelates had little to do except to wait for the issue of events, and always, in fine, to receive the most humble apologies and entreaties for pardon, together with the whole, or at least some part, of their demands, however unreasonable or extravagant.

The papal power was first developed in all its extent by the celebrated Hildebrand, or Gregory VII., who ascended the throne in 1073.* He was a man of undaunted courage and energy, and deeply embued with notions of the extent of the papal supremacy. He accordingly excommunicated and deposed the Emperor Henry IV. of Germany, for disobedience to his mandates, and compelled him at last to sue for absolution with the greatest humility. On further symptoms of disobedience, he again deposed and excommunicated him, gave his dominions to another prince, and excited a rebellion against him. He claimed, and in many instances succeeded in obtaining, the acknowledgment of his feudal superiority, or temporal jurisdiction, over France, England, Hungary, Denmark, Poland, Russia, Norway, Dalmatia, Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica,

A.D. 1077.

* [He had prepared the way for his own undertakings, by the virtual exercise of the papal power under his immediate predecessors, from A.D. 1049. —AM. ED.]

&c. France and England for the present resisted these claims successfully; but in the reign of Pope Innocent III., John, king of England, was obliged to declare himself a subject of the Roman see, and to pay tribute to it. As for the affairs of the *Church* in every country, Gregory disposed of them as if the whole world were his diocese, and the bishops were merely his assistants or deputies. This, indeed, was a notion which in the following centuries was boldly avowed and acted on by the popes. Legates, or papal viceroys, were continually going from Rome into all countries, and enforcing the new mandates or exactions of their masters, to the infinite trouble, expense, and annoyance of kings, prelates, and people; but it was in vain that they protested, petitioned, complained, and threatened, or offered resistance. Their own notions of the papal authority were a chain round their necks, which never failed to bring them ultimately into subjection.

A.D. 1212.

The history of Europe, from this period, for two or three centuries, is little more than a history of the popes; of their contests with emperors and kings; their deposal of some monarchs, their creation of others; of armies which they commanded to be fitted out for the recovery of the Holy Land, for the extermination of heretics, for the subjugation of heathen, or for the dethronement of their own enemies; of the taxes which they levied from all churches and states, either for the crusades, for their own wars with princes, or for their pleasure; of the controversies and wars which their disputed elections excited. All this was done on principle There were good men among the popes and among their adherents; but the false maxims, to which I have before adverted, were so deeply engrained in their minds, that it was a matter of conscience with them to act as they did. The history of these ages is alone sufficient to show that there were some great mistakes abroad with regard to the papal authority; it occupies far too large a space in the transactions of the period before us. Even St. Bernard was obliged

to expend a great portion of his energy, zeal, and piety, for many years, in maintaining the disputed election of a pope. The world and the Church were disturbed with controversies of this kind, to the neglect of the practical duties and elevated contemplations of true religion.

No part of the Church smarted more severely under the papal tyranny (for such it became) than the Church of England. Let us dwell a moment on some particulars of its history in the thirteenth century. In 1240, Cardinal Otho, one of those legates with whom the popes were continually troubling the Churches, published at London a mandate, in which permission was given to all persons who had taken the cross (*i. e.* vowed to fight for the recovery of the Holy Land,) to obtain absolution from their vow, on condition of paying to the pope the sum which they would have expended in their journey. This was a frequent practice of the popes by which they much injured these expeditions. The money went into their coffers, with the understanding that it was to be applied to the use of the Crusaders actually engaged in Palestine; but it was frequently diverted to other purposes. The clergy of England shortly after assembled at Reading, when Cardinal Otho represented that the pope was sorely pressed for money, in his dispute with the Emperor Frederick, and demanded instantly a *fifth* part of their revenues. The bishops objected, but at length paid the exaction. Some time after, a mandate came from the pope to the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishops of Lincoln and Salisbury, to appoint *three hundred* Roman subjects to the next vacant benefices, on pain of being suspended from conferring all benefices!

In 1244 the pope sent an emissary into England, with a letter to the abbots of the diocese of Canterbury, stating that the sums drawn by the late pope from England and other states had been insufficient to discharge his debts contracted for the defence of his patrimony and the liberties of the Church. He therefore ordered them to aid him with the sums of money which his agent should mention within a given

time. The nuncio was supplied with many bulls, in order to bestow the best benefices, or their revenues, on the pope's relatives. The pope soon after wrote to the clergy of England, commanding them to give liberally to the king. In 1245 the ambassadors of the king of England, in the council of Lyons, read a letter, addressed by the kingdom of England to the pope, complaining that his predecessors, wishing to enrich the Italians, who had become excessively numerous, had given them such a multitude of benefices in England, that their income amounted to 60,000 marks of silver, a greater revenue than the king possessed; that these Italians, indifferent to the souls intrusted to them, and only desirous of the revenues of their benefices, lived abroad; that the nuncio had recently conferred all vacant benefices worth thirty marks on Italians, and provided that on their death, others should succeed, to the destruction of the rights of patrons. Many other abuses were mentioned; but the pope, having heard the letter, would make no reply further than that an affair of so much consequence deserved full consideration. In the following year another vigorous attempt was made. It was resolved by the parliament of England that an embassy should carry to the pope *five* letters, from the bishops, the abbots, the lords and commons, and the king, respectfully demanding redress, and threatening, in case of not obtaining it, no longer to obey the Church of Rome. While these letters were on their way, the pope, having learned that many rich English ecclesiastics died intestate, decreed that the possessions of all who should hereafter die intestate should revert to himself; and commissioned the Franciscan and Dominican friars to see to the execution of this mandate. The pope was enraged when he heard of the opposition offered to his exactions, and resolved to place England under an interdict; but he was appeased by the ambassadors, who assured him that the king would speedily yield what he desired. The next year he sent over a mandate that all the resident clergy of England should pay *one-*

*third* of their revenue, and the non-resident *one-half*, to the see of Rome. The clergy, however, were prevented from paying this exaction by the king. In 1252 we find that the king had obtained from the pope *a tenth* of the incomes of the clergy and people of England for three years, under pretence of a crusade. In 1255 a papal nuncio came to levy a tenth in England, Scotland, and Ireland, for the pope or the king. The nuncio then preached a crusade against Mainfroy, king of Sicily, an enemy of the pope, and demanded immense sums from the English bishops for this object.

The proceedings of these few years will afford a sufficient specimen of the servitude to which the prevalence of false maxims had reduced the Church. Some princes resisted such claims more effectually than others; but they were continually liable to recur; and the papal power was always encroaching and usurping the rights of the Church and State.

During the period now under consideration, the evil of appeals to the popes came to its height. No cause could occur in spiritual matters which might not be carried by appeal directly before the tribunal at Rome, to the delay of justice, the impoverishment of suitors, and the subversion of the authority of bishops and metropolitans. Vast sums of money were in this way continually draining out of England; and it should be remembered too, that by custom, or the concession of princes, the jurisdiction of the Church extended in those ages to a great number of temporal causes, besides those of wills, matrimony, tithes, and ecclesiastical property, the right of patronage, and the correction of morals, to which it is now chiefly limited. It is admitted, even by the most learned Romanists, that appeals to the papal see are of mere human institution.

About the twelfth century it became customary with the popes to give dispensations or exemptions from the laws of the Church. They would, either for money or favour, permit one person to hold several benefices or even bishoprics.

They would dispense with a bishop elect remaining without ordination for years,* or would permit children or other improper persons to be nominated to benefices. They would give dispensations for non-residence; for irregularities of all sorts. In short, there was scarcely any law or rule of the Church which they did not continually dispense with. The consequence was, that ecclesiastical discipline became most grievously relaxed. The bishops and clergy were too frequently infected by such evil examples; and a spirit of worldliness, self-indulgence, and habitual neglect of duties, began largely to prevail.

About the same time the popes began to claim the appointment to archbishoprics, bishoprics, and all other benefices. The appointment to the former was first seized on. The ancient custom of sending a pall to the bishop of the principal see in each country, was made the pretext for first exacting an oath of obedience to the pope, then prohibiting the discharge of any metropolitical powers without it. At length the popes began to issue bulls, appointing the metropolitan to his see; and afterwards, especially during the great western schism, from 1370 to 1414, when rival popes divided the whole of Europe into two or three different communions, the appointment to bishoprics, and to all other benefices, was usurped.

The plenary indulgences which the popes issued, first to the Crusaders, but afterwards to many other persons, completed the ruin of the penitential discipline of the Church. These indulgences or pardons were the remission of the lengthened works of penitence imposed by the ancient canons. All that was necessary to obtain them, was to confess to a priest all past sins, to go to the crusade in Palestine or in some other country, or to perform some other work assigned by the pope.

Such were some of the principal evils under which the

* [During which his episcopal functions were discharged, if at all, by vicars, in episcopal orders.—Am. Ed.]

western Churches suffered from the papal supremacy. That supremacy was chiefly sustained by the monks and the begging friars. The former now gradually became extremely relaxed in discipline, and fell into contempt. In the thirteenth century they received incomes from their monasteries, and their situations became so many good benefices. They went out without permission, accepted invitations from laymen, and remained out of their cloister. They had property of their own, borrowed money, went security for others, and partook of all the indulgences of ordinary life. Labour was now commonly discontinued, the time of fasting very much abbreviated, on the pretence that human nature had less strength than in ancient times. The monks were now no longer in deserts, apart from society, and devoted to meditation and silence. They studied at the universities, mingled in the affairs of Church and State, undertook the care of parishes, indulged in recreations. They were generally exempt from the visitations of bishops, by the favour of the Roman pontiffs, and left entirely to their own management.

All this was widely different from the manners of the ancient monks, who were religious in deed, as a learned writer has said, and not merely in name. There was little thought of following the example of the venerable St. Columban. When Sigebert, king of France, had offered him large possessions in that country, in the hope of retaining him there, the holy man replied: "We who have forsaken our own, that according to the commandment of the Gospel, we might follow the Lord, ought not to embrace other men's riches, lest paradventure we should prove transgressors of the divine commandment." The rule universally adopted by the primitive ascetics was, that "they which live in monasteries should *work in silence, and eat their own bread.*"

The begging friars, who were instituted in the thirteenth century, exhibited for a time a very ardent zeal, and a spirit of poverty and self-denial, which in some degree resembled that of the ancient ascetics. Their great boast was, to pos-

sess no property whatever, either personally or as a community. This, however, did not prevent them from having large funds at their disposal; for while they would have esteemed it an unpardonable offence to receive any thing for themselves directly, they had no scruple in receiving donations and benefactions to any amount "for the pope and the Roman Church," to be applied, however, to their own particular uses. This ingenious distinction enabled them to profess their own utter poverty, to beg with the utmost importunity, and to be at once theoretically the poorest, and practically the wealthiest orders in Europe.

A.D. 1340-1360.

Richard Fitz-Ralph, archbishop of Armagh, in the fourteenth century, who was a strong opponent of the begging friars, objected against them, in the presence of the pope and cardinals, that in his time "scarce could any great or mean man of the clergy or the laity eat his meat, but such kind of beggars would be at his elbow; not like other poor folks, humbly craving alms at the gate or the door, (as St. Francis did command and teach them in his testament,) by begging, but without shame intruding themselves into courts or houses, and lodging there, where, without any invitation at all, they eat and drink what they find among them; and not content with that, carry away with them either wheat, or meal, or bread, or flesh, or cheeses, although there were but two in a house, in a kind of extorting manner, there being none that can deny them, unless he should cast away natural modesty." Religion was degraded by this mean and sordid system, which clothed itself with the character of superior piety and perfection, while it disgusted every pious mind by its habits of grasping extortion. The spirit of secularity and of luxury soon found an entrance amongst these begging friars; they became still more engaged in the affairs of the world than the monks, and fixed their residences in the midst of populous cities and of the world.

What might naturally be expected, followed. The monas-

teries, which had been originally intended to afford examples of perfect purity, devotion towards God, and deadness to the world, were polluted by gross sins; and having ceased to be advantageous to Christianity,—though even in the worst times they were useful to a certain extent in preserving ancient books and monuments, and in affording education,—they had become an incumbrance to the Church, which it was necessary to remove.

The bishops and clergy themselves shared but too often in the evils of the times. We read of archbishops and bishops engaged in wars, crusades, and other temporal avocations. They were chancellors, chief-justiciaries, ministers, regents, embassadors. Hunting and hawking were their not unfrequent amusements. They were engaged more in temporal than spiritual affairs. The clergy were still ignorant, though less so than in former ages. They too much neglected preaching; and the mendicant friars, by permission of the popes, half superseded them in their offices,—preached, administered the sacraments, and became spiritual directors of their parishioners. The bishops and clergy were often exceedingly unpopular amongst the laity, and bitter complaints were made of their ambition and exactions.

Let me now notice a few of the corruptions introduced in these ages. In the eleventh century it was supposed that for every particular sin it was necessary to fulfil the time of penitence prescribed by the ancient canons; so that if ten years had been appointed for homicide, a man who had committed that sin twenty times was bound to discharge two hundred years of penance. This led ingenious men to discover ways of paying the debt. Peter Damian, A.D. 1007-1074. in the twelfth century, affirmed that the repetition of the Psalter twenty times, accompanied by discipline (that is, scourging,) was equal to a hundred years of penitence. A friend of his requested him, at the beginning of Lent, to impose on him a thousand years of penitence, and he nearly finished his satisfaction before the end

of Lent! Another invention was the discharge of penitence by one person for another. These strange doctrines obtained much popularity, though many persons disapproved of them.

A distinct office in honour of the Virgin was used by some persons in the tenth century; it became common in the eleventh; and the monks, about the same time, added the office of the dead to their daily devotions. In these ages, persons not unfrequently, on the approach of death, caused themselves to be arrayed in the garments of monks, imagining that these holy vestments would protect them against the devil. In the thirteenth century, a new devotion for the laity was invented by Dominic. Men were taught to repeat the angel's salutation to the Virgin 150 times, and the Lord's Prayer fifteen times, that is, once after each decade of Aves. The prayers were reckoned by beads; and the whole ceremony obtained the name of Rosary. Dominic invented some other devotions to the Virgin Mary. The scapulary, a portion of the monk's dress, was now worn by some persons as a sort of charm: the Carmelites were loud in their assurances of the blessings which might be expected by its possessors. Several persons wore sackcloth or haircloth next their skin, by way of voluntary mortification. The mendicant friars introduced a custom which was extremely prejudicial in its effects. They granted absolution immediately to those who confessed their sins, without waiting for the accomplishment of the penitence which they assigned them. This led men to think they might sin without danger; as a simple confession, with promise of amendment was sufficient to procure the priests' remission of their sins In the thirteenth century also, the eucharist began to be elevated after consecration, and the people were taught to bow or prostrate themselves at the same time. Hence many persons were in danger of offering worship to the bread and wine. It became customary in this age to administer the sacrament to the laity only in one kind, that is, the bread.

This custom was inconsistent with the institution of our Lord, and the practice of the whole Church for more than a thousand years; but it was nevertheless sanctioned by the councils of Constance in 1414, and Basil in 1438. I have not spoken of the invocation of saints, the veneration for relics and images, which in these ages continued to be excessive, nor of many other minor superstitions and errors. These will sufficiently show the great necessity for reformation in the Church. It is true, indeed, that many persons were more or less free from superstitions; but a great change was imperatively called for. Few things needed reformation more than the system of theological instruction in universities, commonly called the scholastic theology.

Schools for the instruction of the clergy and laity had existed generally in cathedral churches and monasteries from the remotest antiquity; but, about the twelfth century, the schools in some cities became very celebrated and extensive, and were known under the name of *Universities*. The principal universities, during the middle ages, were those of Paris, Oxford, Bologna, and Salamanca. They were endowed with revenues, and granted many privileges, by princes and popes. Instruction was given to students in the four faculties of theology, law, medicine, and the arts, by the doctors in those faculties. Peter Lombard, bishop of Paris, a celebrated doctor of theology, published a treatise entitled the *The Book of Sentences*, A.D. 1172. in which the various doctrines of revelation were collected and explained from the writings of the fathers. This work formed the basis of the scholastic theology; it became the text-book on which all the subsequent theologians commented, and to which they added all the subtilties of the Aristotelic philosophy. The ablest of the scholastic writers were Thomas Aquinas and Scotus.

The text-book of the canonists, or students of canon law, was the work of Gratian, a Benedictine monk, entitled *Decretum*, and written about A.D. 1130, in which the ancient

canons of councils were collected, and reconciled with each other and with the decretals of the popes. In this collection all the spurious decretals of the early popes, fabricated in the eighth and ninth centuries, were introduced; and as Gratian entertained very exaggerated notions of the papal authority, this book, which was immediately received as of the highest authority in all the schools of Europe, tended greatly to increase the influence of the popes. The study of canon law became so popular, and led so certainly to advancement in the Church, that theology and the arts were much neglected; and more than one pope felt himself bound to discourage this exclusive application.

From the twelfth century, the writers of the early fathers and the decrees of councils were little known in the schools, except through the medium of *The Book of Sentences* or the *Decretum*. This is allowed by a learned Roman Catholic historian, the Abbé Fleury, who says, that "it was the misfortune of the doctors of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries to know but little of the writings of the fathers, especially the more ancient, and to be deficient in the aids requisite for well understanding them. It is not that their books were lost; they existed, for we have them still; but the copies were scarce, and hidden in the libraries of the ancient monasteries, where little use was made of them." He adds, that King Louis IX. of France, in the thirteenth century, caused many of them to be transcribed; and that Vincent of Beauvais made extracts from them, and John of Salisbury cited them frequently: "but," he continues, "this was merely the curiosity of some individuals. The generality of students, and even of doctors, limited themselves to a few books, chiefly those of modern authors, which they understood better than the ancients." "I do not cease to wonder," he continues, "that in such calamitous times, and with such small aid, the doctors so faithfully preserved to us the deposit of tradition with regard to doctrine." The Abbé Goujet, an-

A.D. 1260.

A.D. 1130-1182.

other Roman Catholic divine, confirms this; and observes also, that the study of *Scripture* "had been extremely neglected" in these ages. "They did not study it even in the schools of theology but with lukewarmness; and often contented themselves with such extracts from it as were found in the writings of some superficial theologian. Hence arose the ignorance of the clergy, and the few defenders which the Church found against heresies. . . . . At length the study of holy Scripture caused men to escape from this lethargy; men then perceived the crowd of errors and false opinions which had inundated the whole Church, and had nearly choked the good seed." The fallen state of theological study at the time of the Reformation may be collected from the complaints of the faculty of arts in the university of Paris in 1530. "The study of sacred Scripture," they said, "is neglected. The holy Gospels are no longer cited. The authority of St. Chrysostom, St. Cyprian, St. Augustine, and the other fathers, is not employed. Theology has become nothing but a sophistical science." Under such circumstances it was to be expected that erroneous opinions would become more or less prevalent in the Church. The holy Scriptures had been undoubtedly given by God, that "the man of God might be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works;" and when this divine means of grace and wisdom was neglected, as it certainly was to a considerable degree in these times, it could not be supposed that the same purity of doctrine or of practice should exist as in the primitive ages of the Church.

## CHAPTER XXI.

### THE FOREIGN REFORMATION.

### A.D. 1517-1839.

THE enormous power usurped by the popes, and the abuses in its exercise, at length paved the way for its own subversion, and for the Reformation. Never were its exactions and abuses so excessive as in the time of what is called the great schism, from 1369 to 1414, when Europe was divided under the domination of rival popes. The papacy was greatly lowered in public estimation by this division; and France, on one occasion, withdrew itself from the obedience of both popes. The contests which arose between the councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basil, in the early part of the fifteenth century, and the popes, in which each party asserted its own infallibility, and its superiority to the other, excited a spirit of inquiry. "The reformation of the Church, in its head and members," was now one of the objects avowed by every considerable council that assembled. Wickliffe had, in the preceding century, declaimed against the popes and against several abuses;* and he was closely followed by Huss, and Jerome of Prague: but their opinions were mingled with much that was exceptionable; and they seem to have been unfitted rightly to conduct the mighty work of reformation. The revival of learning, in the fifteenth century, was the great forerunner of improvement. Men now began to study the writings of the fathers, which had only been known at second-hand, from the books of Lombard and Gratian. The introduction of the Greek and Hebrew languages (entirely unknown during the middle ages) rendered

A.D. 1324-1384.

Burnt A.D. 1415 & 1416.

* [More ought to have been said of this great precursor of the Reformation. See his very interesting and able Life, by Mr. Le Bas.—AM. ED.]

the study of Scripture in the originals possible; the scholastic writers began to lose their credit with men of education.

At length the Reformation began; but not as it could have been desired; not promoted by the heads of the Church, not regulated by the decrees of councils. An individual monk in Saxony was made the involuntary instrument by which this great work was set on foot. Martin Luther, an Augustinian friar, when he declaimed against the scandalous sale of indulgences by the papal agent Tetzel, had little notion of opposing the papal supremacy, or reforming the Church. He simply rejected with indignation the notion, that by purchasing certain indulgences, the soul was to be freed from torments after death; and reminded men that indulgences were originally nothing more than the remission of canonical penance in this life. When assailed by Eckius and many others with the most furious violence, he was led to further investigation; and he showed, in his conference with Eckius, at Leipsic, that the Roman Church had not originally any supremacy over the universal Church. He, however, testified to the pope his earnest desire for peace, and submitted himself entirely to him: but when Luther declined to retract, without any discussion, whatever Cardinal Cajetan might censure in his doctrine, the pope, notwithstanding his submissive tone, and protestations that he did not intend any separation from the Church, excommunicated him and his favourers, in 1521.

A.D. 1517.

A.D. 1519.

Luther, and his friends Melancthon, Carlostadt, and all who were of the same sentiments, were thus separated from the communion of the pope, and of his adherents in Germany, not voluntarily, or by their own act. They were now, however, able to examine and to speak more freely; and a strong controversy immediately arose, in which the prevalent errors and superstitions were assailed unsparingly; while every effort was made by the Romish party to procure the extirpation and destruction of their opponents. The Lu-

theran party were protected by the electors of Saxony and Brandenburg, and many other princes and states in Germany; and they continually called for the assembling of a free and general council, to whose decision they offered to submit themselves. In the meantime, various abuses were corrected in the churches of those states, and a temporary system of Church government was established by the Lutherans, which they intended to be replaced by the ordinary episcopal government, when the council had arranged their disputes, and they should be united again to the Church. But Providence forbade the accomplishment of their wishes: an arrangement, which the contending parties had come to in the diet or parliament of Spires, in 1526, and which left the Lutheran states free to regulate their own ecclesiastical affairs until the general council could be called together, was set aside by a new diet at the same place, in which all alterations were prohibited by a majority of votes. The Lutheran princes and states entered a PROTEST against this edict, and from this they were termed PROTESTANTS. The term Protestant, therefore, does not properly signify a protest against the errors of the Church of Rome, but against the edict of Spires. It belongs properly to the Lutherans, by whom in fact it is claimed, as being peculiarly their own; while the Church of England has never applied the term to herself, nor ever used it in any of her formularies. In the following year a diet was convened at Augsburg, by the Emperor Charles V., with the intent of terminating these differences. The Lutheran party here presented their confession of faith, which has since been called the Confession of Augsburg; and which contains a brief summary of the Christian doctrine, together with their objections to the chief errors and superstitions then prevalent. The Confession of Augsburg professes that there is nothing in it "which differs from the Scriptures or the *Roman Church*." It declares that they "differ concerning no article of faith from the Catholic

A.D. 1529.

A.D. 1530.

Church, but only omit some abuses." "There is no design," they said, "to deprive the bishops of their authority; but this only is sought, that the Gospel be permitted to be purely taught, and a few observances be relaxed."

Notwithstanding this moderation, the diet, by order of the emperor, condemned the Protestants, and ordered them to submit themselves to the pope. They were then obliged to confederate in their own defence, in the league of Smalcald, and by this means they obtained toleration from the emperor. Various controversies and conferences afterwards took place between the opposed parties, especially in 1541, at Ratisbon, when many of the points of difference were removed, and both parties, including the papal nuncio, were in great hopes of an entire agreement.

The Protestants had continued their appeal to a free general council from the year 1520; but the pope, who had usurped for some centuries past the privilege of assembling such councils, refused to do so in the present instance, except in places where there was no security for the safety of the Protestants. The pope at length fixed on Trent as the place of meeting; and when the Protestants objected to it, on various grounds, the emperor and pope conspired to crush them by force. Accordingly, Charles V. declared war against them, and overthrew them in the battle of Muhlberg. A.D. 1547. In the mean time, the council of Trent had met in 1545; and having decided several points in controversy in the absence of the Protestants, had been prorogued in 1547. The emperor, therefore, being unable to compel the Protestants to send deputies, was obliged to be satisfied with issuing a formulary of faith and discipline, called *The Interim;* in which the chief points permitted to the Lutherans were the marriage of the clergy, and the use of the cup in the sacrament. When the council again assembled, the A.D. 1551. Protestants were compelled to send deputies there; but when they required that the articles already decided by forty or fifty bishops at Trent should be re-examin-

ed, they were not listened to. They were consequently obliged to withdraw from the council, and to retain their own observances, without any hope of reconciliation with the Church. They were enabled to mantain their religious liberty by the advantages gained over the emperor by the Elector Maurice of Saxony, which led to the pacification of Passau, by which the religion and liberties of the Protestants were secured from further molestation.

A.D. 1552.

In the mean time, the Reformation, as established by Luther and Melancthon, spread itself widely. Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, together with a great part of Germany, embraced it. Monasteries were suppressed; purgatory, indulgences, invocation of saints, worship of pictures and relics, flagellations, communion in one kind only, rosaries, scapularies, and a number of other errors and superstitions, disappeared. The Scriptures were translated afresh, and read by all the people. Divine service was celebrated in a known language, and sermons were frequently delivered. Episcopacy was never rejected by the Lutherans; they even retain the form of that ecclesiastical government in several countries, and it is said that their bishops in Sweden are validly ordained.

It is to be lamented, however, that the Lutherans after a time forgot that their system was merely provisional, and designed only to last till a general council could be lawfully assembled. They then began to pretend that their ancestors had separated *voluntarily* from the western Church, and justified this act by reasons which sanctioned schism and separation generally. In the seventeenth century there were many learned men amongst them; but they were much troubled by religious parties, and were threatened with destruction in the war which was waged against them for thirty years by the emperors and the Romish party, and which was at length terminated by the peace of Westphalia. In the middle of the following century, a spirit of false

A.D. 1648.

liberality and scepticism began to infect the Lutheran communities. The Confession of Augsburg, and other formularies of the sixteenth century, to which their ministers had subscribed, lost their authority, and an unbounded freedom of opinion on all points was encouraged. The result was, the rise of a party headed by the notorious Semler, who, under the mask of Christianity, explained away all the doctrines of revelation, denied the miracles and other facts of sacred history, and subverted the genuineness and authenticity of the Bible. This infidelity became dreadfully prevalent among the Protestants of Germany and Denmark in the course of the last and present centuries; the universities were full of it, the ministers of religion tainted with it; and the Lutheran faith seems under an eclipse, from whence we fervently pray that it may be delivered. A.D. 1725-1791.

It is now time to consider the Reformation in Switzerland, France, and the United Provinces. Zuingle, a clergyman in Switzerland, from the year 1519 preached in the church at Zurich against the corruptions of that period;* but after some time he was treated as a heretic by the adherents of the pope; and had he not been protected by the magistrates, would have fallen a sacrifice to their rage. A reformation then took place in Switzerland, which was carried too far in some respects; and on the subject of the sacraments especially, Zuingle was severely condemned by Luther for considering the eucharist a mere sign of our Lord's body. His views on baptism were also very defective. Some years after his death, Calvin, a man of abilities and learning, obtained a vast influence among the reformed in Switzerland, France, Holland, Germany, &c. He was called to Geneva by the inhabitants of that city, and became their pastor. His well known doctrinal system A.D. 1541.

* [Zuingle's stand, as a Scriptural teacher, in opposition to the prevalent errors both of doctrine and practice, had been taken before Luther's open hostilities; even as early as 1510.—Am. Ed.]

of irrespective election and irresistible grace obtained a wide currency. His views on the eucharist were apparently very much more sound than those of Zuingle. He was the founder of the Presbyterian system of Church government.

In France, the doctrines of Luther obtained adherents very early; but their professors were most bitterly persecuted for a long series of years. They were favoured by many of the nobility, and headed by the Queen of Navarre, and afterwards by her son Henry IV. of France. A league was formed for their extirpation by the powerful family of the Guises; and, in 1572, the massacre of St. Bartholomew, commanded by Charles IX., destroyed many of their leaders and a vast multitude of the people. At length, after much cruel persecution, they obtained toleration by the edict of Nantes. The reformed party in France at that time followed the doctrines of Calvin, and Beza his coadjutor. They continued to exist during the seventeenth century; but in the year 1685, Louis XIV. revoked the edict of Nantes, and they were then compelled either to emigrate, to conform to the Church of France, or to conceal themselves. They have latterly become a small and feeble party.

A.D. 1598.

The persecutions of the Spanish government for the sake of religion, obliged the seven United Provinces of Holland to arm in their own defence in the latter part of the sixteenth century; and after a desperate struggle, they succeeded in obtaining civil and religious freedom. They also adopted the doctrines of Calvin; but in the following century they were torn by controversies between his followers and those of Arminius.

It may be observed in general of the reformed communities in Switzerland, France, and the United Provinces, that they have too generally fallen away from the doctrines originally believed by them, into the Socinian or Arian heresies.

It remains now to notice briefly a few of the principal leaders of the Reformation on the continent.

Martin Luther was born in Saxony, in 1483; and having been early instructed in letters, he went to the university of Erfurt, where he studied the classics, the Aristotelic philosophy, and the civil law, with the intent of advancing himself at the bar; but he was diverted from this intention by the following accident. As he was walking with a friend one day in the fields, he was struck by lightning, which threw him to the ground, and which killed his companion at his side. This circumstance so profoundly affected him, that, without communicating his design to his friends, he immediately entered the order of Augustinian friars. Here he applied himself closely to the study of the scholastic writers, and afterwards to that of the Bible; and was ordained priest in 1507, after which he was chosen by the elector of Saxony to a professorship in his new university of Wittemburg. In 1510 he was appointed by his order to go to Rome to plead their cause, on occasion of a dispute with their general; and this afforded him an opportunity to see and condemn the gross corruptions and scandals of all sorts in that city; but it was not till Tetzel began the scandalous sale of indulgences in Germany, and promised remission of all past and future sins for money, that Luther was led to examine deeply into the existing abuses. He had, however, no intention of separating from the communion of the Church; he repeatedly, in the course of four years, between 1517 and 1521, declared that he was ready to be silent and to submit himself to the judgment of bishops, or of the Roman see, provided that his adversaries were also commanded to be silent. Even when he found that the pope was under the influence of his personal enemies, he did not reject the jurisdiction of the Church, but appealed to the next general council; and, in fine, he and his friends were expelled from the communion of the Roman Church in a very unjustifiable manner, and did not voluntarily forsake it.

In 1521 Luther was called to the diet of Worms by the emperor, to ascertain whether he really held the errors im-

puted to him. His friends were very reluctant that he should attend the diet, fearing that, in spite of the emperor's safe conduct, he might be seized and put to death by his enemies; but Luther said, "I am lawfully called to appear in that city, and thither will I go, in the name of the Lord, though as many devils as there are tiles on the houses were there combined against me." In this diet Luther firmly refused to retract his doctrines, unless they were proved contrary to the word of God; and being dismissed unhurt, he was presently seized and hid in the castle of Wartburg by his friend the elector of Saxony; for a severe edict had been issued against him by the diet immediately after he had departed. In this solitude Luther began the translation of the Bible into the vernacular language, and composed several books in defence of his doctrines. In 1522 he returned to Wittemburg to check the excesses of Carlostadt, who had broken the images of saints, and was proceeding with reforms indiscreetly and irregularly. Soon after, great part of the Bible was published, and had much effect in promoting the progress of the Reformation throughout Germany. From this time Luther continued to reside at Wittemburg, and was the head of the Reformation in Germany. He composed commentaries on the Bible; was always vehemently opposed to the papal authority, which he regarded as an anti-christian usurpation; and died in 1546, in the sixty-second year of his age.

Philip Melancthon, a friend of Luther, and who succeeded at his death to the chief influence amongst the Protestant party in Germany, was born in 1495, and was distinguished at an early age by his attainments in every sort of literature; so that, in 1518, when only twenty-three years of age, he was appointed professor of Greek at Wittemburg, where he contracted a close intimacy with Luther, and was converted to his opinions by the disputation which took place betwen Luther and Eckius. Melancthon, in 1520, read lectures on St. Paul's epistles,

A.D. 1519.

which were highly approved by Luther, and printed. He afterwards drew up the Confession of Augsburg, and the Apology or defence of that confession, which became the standards of doctrine among the Lutheran party. He was remarkable for his moderation; was always most desirous that the Church should be re-united; and was ready to make considerable sacrifices in order to attain so desirable an object. He wished the authority of bishops to be preserved, and would even have been contented to allow some authority to the see of Rome: but his views were far too moderate to satisfy the papal party; and the Lutherans had been too severely persecuted to regard them with much favour. Melancthon wrote much in defence of Luther, and against the Romish errors; and died in 1560.

John Calvin was born in France, in 1509, and studied at the university of Paris. The discipline of the Church at that time was so relaxed, that although he was not in sacred orders, he had been presented successively to three benefices when he was but twenty years old. Having studied the Scriptures, and becoming alive to the errors and superstitions then prevalent, he resolved to relinquish the design of taking holy orders, and to apply himself to the law; on which he resigned his benefices. His studies led him to embrace the doctrines of the Reformation; and a violent persecution arising against all who "were of that way" in France, he was compelled to fly for his life into Switzerland, where, in 1535, he published his *Institution*,* as an apology for those who were burned for their religion in France. The next year, as he passed through Geneva, the citizens of that town compelled him to be their pastor and professor of divinity; but, in consequence of his resolution to put a stop to the immoralities and factions of that place, by enforcing a rigorous discipline, he was banished from Geneva. He was again recalled in 1541, when he established a form of Church disci-

* [Namely, a systematic exhibition of religious truth, according to the views of those who were persecuted as heretics.—Am. Ed.]

pline, and a consistory, invested with power to inflict canonical censures and excommunications, to which the magistrates and people of Geneva promised obedience. Calvin was a vigorous opponent of the common errors and superstitions, and caused Servetus, who blasphemed against the Holy Trinity, to be put to death. He wrote many commentaries on Scripture. His influence was widely extended throughout the reformed communities by his correspondence. Calvin was a man of great genius, considerable learning, and of irreproachable private character; but of a zeal which was too little under the guidance of charity. His position, as the minister of the people at Geneva, was certainly an irregularity and anomaly, as he had never received holy orders. It was only excusable under the difficulties of the times, when the bishops of the Continent were too generally under the influence of the pope, and the adherents of the Reformation were unjustly cast out of the Church, and treated as heretics. It seems to have been held by many persons, and not without some grounds of probability, that in such an extreme case, a Christian community might constitute pastors; although we cannot feel *certain* that divine grace accompanies such ministrations. It was, perhaps, a reliance on the uncovenanted mercies of God, which consoled many pious men in the unavoidable absence of that lawful ordinary ministry, which was instituted by Jesus Christ, and which has continued by successive ordinations in all ages. Calvin died in 1564.

Ulric Zuingle was born in Switzerland, in 1484, and studied at Basil and Vienna; after which he received holy orders, and became successively pastor of Glaris, and preacher at the abbey of Einsidlen. Having diligently studied Scripture, the fathers, and schoolmen, he began to see the corruptions so generally prevalent; and he addressed himself, in the first instance, to the bishop of Constance, and the cardinal bishop of Sion, urging them to reform the Swiss churches. Being appointed, in 1519, to the principal church in Zurich,

he declaimed against the sale of indulgences, and against other common errors. Controversies ensued between Zuingle and the vicar-general of the bishop of Constance, who accused him of heresy and sedition to the magistrates of Zurich. Zuingle and his friends declared "that they did not, either in act or intention, separate from the Church." Zuingle was again accused, in 1522 and 1523, by the Romish party, as a heretic; but he overcame his adversaries in controversy; and the magistrates of Zurich decreed that he should not be molested, and that the clergy should preach nothing except what could be proved from holy Scripture. After this, Zuingle and his friends being entirely separated from communion by the Romish party, they effected various reforms and changes in rites; and they became involved in controversy with Luther on the subject of the holy eucharist. Zuingle seems to have fallen into the error of Berengar* on this point; but it was hoped for a long time, that he and his adherents might be brought to a sounder mind. Conferences with this object continued long after his death, which took place in 1531.

---

## CHAPTER XXII.

### ON THE BRITISH CHURCHES.

### A.D. 1530-1839.

THE Churches of Britain or England had now existed for more than thirteen hundred years. Originally (for six hundred years) independent of the Roman see, as being beyond the limits of that patriarchate, they had gradually become subject to its jurisdiction. The invasion of Britain by the Saxons, and the subsequent mission of St. Augustine, by Pope Gregory, afforded the opportunity for extending the Roman

[* See notes on pages 78, and 81.—AM. ED.]

power; and Augustine was sent the pall, the emblem of authority, as vicar of the holy see. For many ages, however, we hear little of any exercise of jurisdiction by the popes in England: the English bishops and kings did not permit appeals to Rome. When Wilfrid, bishop of York, appealed against an English synod which had deposed him from his diocese, and obtained a decree in his favour from the pope, that decree was disregarded in England. At length, from the time of Gregory VII., the papal jurisdiction was pushed into England, as it was into other countries; legates made frequent visits, held councils, exacted subsidies. Appeals, dispensations, mandates, reserves, annates, bulls, and all the other inconveniences of papal usurpation, followed each other in rapid succession; and for four centuries, no country in Europe suffered more, and with greater reluctance, than England. But the popes and the kings of England had, after much disputation, made their agreement, and the Church was their prey.

A.D. 680.

A.D. 1073.

Religion had become deteriorated in England, as well as in the remainder of the western Church. A spirit of opposition to prevailing errors had been excited by Wickliffe; but he and his followers, the Lollards, advocated several erroneous and seditious opinions: they were condemned by the clergy, and persecuted by the state. The Scriptures, however, were translated by Wickliffe; and thus the way was prepared for religious improvement.

The scruples of Henry VIII. as to the lawfulness of his marriage with Catharine, the widow of his elder brother, led ultimately to the removal of the papal power in England, and to the Reformation. Henry in 1526 commenced negotiations with the pope, for the dissolution of his marriage, requesting that the papal dispensation by which it had been contracted might be examined, or declared invalid. But the pope, under the influence of the Emperor Charles V., the nephew of Catharine, protracted the affair, by various expedients, for six years. At length Henry, wearied by the arts

and chicanery of the court of Rome, had recourse to an expedient, first suggested by Cranmer, a learned doctor of Cambridge, who was soon after made archbishop of Canterbury, namely, to consult all the universities of Europe on the question, "whether the papal dispensation for such a marriage was valid;" and to act on their decision without further appeal to the pope. The question was accordingly put, and decided in the negative by the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Paris, Bologna, Padua, Orleans, Angiers, Bourges, Toulouse, &c., and by a multitude of theologians and canonists. Henry now being satisfied that his marriage with Catharine had been null and void from the beginning, privately married Anna Boleyn; and the convocation of the Church of England immediately afterwards declared his former marriage null, and approved that recently contracted. A.D. 1532.

In 1532 and 1533 the king and parliament of England suppressed by law various usurped or superfluous privileges of the popes. First-fruits, tenths, pensions, annuities, payments for bulls, palls, &c., censes, portions, Peter's-pence, and all the other pecuniary exactions of the court of Rome, were abolished. Bulls of institution to bishoprics or archbishoprics, and palls, were no longer to be sought from Rome. The prelates were, as formerly, to be elected and ordained in England. All appeals to Rome in ecclesiastical causes were suppressed; and every cause was to be determined finally in England, according to ancient custom. All that great multiplicity of licenses, dispensations, compositions, faculties, grants, rescripts, delegacies, &c., by which the pontiffs had so grievously enervated the discipline of the Church and enriched themselves, was put an end to. Dispensations were in future only to be issued by the primate of England. Thus the various branches of the papal jurisdiction, most of which had been usurped within the four preceding centuries, were removed. The Church of England acquiesced in these proceedings, well knowing that no principle of justice

or of right was infringed by them; and in fine, the question being proposed to the bishops and clergy assembled in the provincial synods of Canterbury and York, "whether the bishop of Rome has, in the word of God, any greater jurisdiction in the realm of England than any other foreign bishop;" it was determined in the negative. The universities, chapters, monks, friars, &c., throughout the kingdom, declared their assent; one bishop only (Fisher) refused to unite in this general decision of the Church of England; and thus the ordinary jurisdiction of the pope over England was regularly and lawfully suppressed.

A.D. 1534.

The door was now open for gradual improvement; and though the king remained attached to some errors and abuses, several valuable reforms were made during the remainder of his reign. In 1537 and 1543, the convocation published two formularies of doctrine, entitled the *Institution of a Christian Man*, and the *Necessary Doctrine and Erudition;* in which the doctrine of purgatory was disclaimed. Indulgences were rejected by the same authority, together with all kneeling, bowing, and offering to images, and all worship before them was to be directed to God only, not to the image or the saint represented. Images abused by pilgrimages, and other special honours, were removed; prayer to saints was prohibited, and their invocation only permitted under certain limitations. The superstitious use of relics was discouraged; and various other superstitions, such as using gospels for charms, drinking holy water for the cure of diseases, &c., were prohibited. These were great advances and improvements; but the king opposed a full reformation, and in the parliament of 1539 made penal laws against any who rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation, the celibacy of the clergy, and some other points. The convocation of the clergy in 1531 had acknowledged the king to be "head of the Church of England, as far as it is allowable by the law of Christ." In virtue of this office, which Henry seems to have understood in a different sense from that of the convocation,

he appointed Lord Cromwell his vicar-general, and visitor of monasteries; and a visitation of these institutions having been set on foot, they were found to be so generally corrupt and fallen from their rule, that they were all suppressed, and their enormous revenues were given to the king, with a portion of which he founded six new bishoprics in England.

On the death of Henry VIII. in 1547, and the accession of Edward VI., the work of reformation proceeded freely. The communion was now given in both kinds to the laity, according to our Lord's institution and the practice of the Catholic Church; images and relics, so long abused to superstition, were removed; the clergy were permitted to marry; and the public prayers were translated from the old Latin offices of the English Church, with various improvements from the Greek and Oriental liturgies. These reforms were made by the united authority of the bishops, or convocation, and the parliament.

The popes had thought proper to consider England in a state of schism and separation from the Church, as soon as their own usurped jurisdiction was abolished. The Church and realm of England repeatedly disclaimed any intention of separating from the communion of the Roman, French, Spanish, and other western Churches, subject to the pope; they never thought of refusing communion to the members of those Churches: but the popes and their party in the West still adhered obstinately to the mistaken notion, that the bishop of Rome was, by divine right, head of the universal Church; and therefore they looked on the conduct of the English Church, in removing his power, as sinful; and when the pope deposed and excommunicated Henry VIII. and his adherents, they considered England as out of the pale of the Church. There was a party in England which secretly held the same views, and were attached to the old superstitions, though they did not venture to separate from the Church.

On the death of Edward in 1553, and the accession of Mary, who was a devoted adherent of the pope, the popish

party obtained the ascendant for a time, and involved the Church in confusion and misery. No fewer than *fourteen* of the bishops, who were favourable to the Reformation, were expelled from their sees, by intimidation, by commissions irregularly appointed by the crown, or by mere intrusion of persons who had been schismatically appointed. They were replaced by others, who were constituted by the pope, in opposition to the laws and regulations approved by the Church of England during the two preceding reigns, and in violation of its liberties. Independently of which, the pope acted without any right of jurisdiction whatever; for his jurisdiction had been many years before regularly and validly suppressed by the Church of England, by whose permission alone it was at any time lawful; and the Church had never, by any decree of its convocations, revised or created again that jurisdiction; but the popish party merely implored the papal absolution for their schism. Consequently, all acts performed by the pope or his authority at this time were unauthorised and null. At the same time, an obsequious parliament repealed all the laws in favour of the Reformation; and at their humble request the pope granted his *absolution* to the English nation for the *schism* of which it had been guilty. A most savage persecution assailed all who were in favour of reformation, and who rejected the papal supremacy. The venerable Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, Bishops Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, and hundreds of others, bishops, presbyters, and pious men and women, fell victims to the ferocity of the papists, and attested with their last breath their adherence to the cause of pure religion. Three thousand of the clergy were expelled from their churches; multitudes of confessors were driven into exile, where they lived till the death of this persecuting queen in 1558.

The accession of the illustrious Queen Elizabeth was followed by the restoration of the Church to its former state. The laws which had been formerly made, with the full concurrence of the Church, in the reign of Henry and Edward,

and which always remained in their spiritual obligation, having never been condemned by the Church of England, were now restored. The popish intruders into English bishopries were expelled by the civil power, and their places were filled by orthodox prelates, who were ordained by some of the bishops who had been persecuted by Mary and driven into exile. The clergy generally approved of the return to pure religion, and retained their benefices, administering the sacraments and rites according to the English ritual. In 1562, the synod or convocation of England, published a formulary of doctrine, divided into thirty-nine articles, in which the doctrines of the Catholic faith were briefly stated, and various errors and superstitions of the Romanists and others were rejected. This formulary was again approved by the convocation in 1571, and ordered to be subscribed by all the clergy. There was no schism for many years in England: all the people worshipped in the same churches, and acknowledged the same pastors. It is true that persons were to be found, who secretly cherished a love for the old superstitions and abuses, and for the Roman sway. This was not to be wondered at. Men's minds will differ on almost every subject; but more information would have probably removed in the end any such tendency.

The pope was much annoyed at these proceedings in England; he took no decided steps, however, for some time. At last, in 1569, Pius V. issued a bull, in which he excommunicated Queen Elizabeth and her supporters, absolved her subjects from their oaths of allegiance, and bestowed her dominions on the king of Spain. This bull caused the schism in England; for the popish party, which had continued in communion with the Church of England up to that time, during the eleven past years of Elizabeth's reign, now began to separate themselves. Bedingfield, Cornwallis, and Silyarde, were the first popish recusants; and the date of the Romanists in England, as a distinct sect or community, may be fixed in the year 1570. This separation was also fomented

by priests and Jesuits, who were sent from abroad to pervert the people: but they did not succeed to any great extent. It may be here added, that, with the exception of about six years, when a titular bishop, sent by the pope, resided in England, the Romanists had no bishops till 1685.

The same year which witnessed the separation of the Romanists, was also the commencement of the Puritan separation. The origin of this sect, which at last acquired such power, may be traced to some of the exiles in the reign of Mary, who in foreign lands imbibed a taste for the doctrines and discipline of Calvin and Zuingle, and who, on their return, endeavoured vainly to reform the Church of England according to those models. When they beheld the Reformation re-established according to the forms adopted in the reign of King Edward, they became dissatisfied; and after much fruitless agitation to alter the Church, they at length began to declaim against her as infected with popish errors and superstitions; and affirming episcopacy to be anti-Christian, they separated from the Church and formed conventicles, about 1570.

The Church of England continued to be defended by the state till the great rebellion in 1640, when the king and parliament being at variance, the Puritans, and a number of other sects, were permitted to increase. Of these sects, the principal were the Brownists or Independents, and the Anabaptists, which had been set on foot in England a few years before. The parliament, under the influence of the Puritans, abolished episcopacy as anti-Christian, rejected the Liturgy, and expelled several thousands of the clergy who adhered to the regulations of the Church of England, intruding in their place Puritans and other sectarians.

In 1660, on the restoration of King Charles II. to the throne of his ancestors, the Puritans were expelled, and the Church was delivered from persecution, and prospered exceedingly for many years. Many learned and great men were now appointed to preside over the Church, and the various sects of separatists or dissenters diminished. James

II. attempted, by many arbitrary and illegal proceedings, to establish popery, which excited the indignation of his subjects so strongly, that he was compelled to abdicate his throne in 1689, and William III. of Orange, and Mary, were declared king and queen. On the refusal of Sancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, and some other bishops and clergy, from conscientious scruples, to take the oaths of allegiance to the new government, they were deprived of their sees and benefices by the civil power, and they, with their adherents, obtained the name of Non-jurors. Bishops were ordained in their places, and accepted by the great body of the Church of England; but a warm controversy ensued, which, however, terminated in the gradual return of the Non-jurors to the Church.

In 1717 a controversy arose on occasion of the writings of Hoadly, bishop of Bangor, in which he maintained that it was needless to believe any particular creed, or to be united to any particular Church; and that sincerity, or our own persuasion of the correctness of our opinions (whether well or ill founded,) is sufficient. These doctrines were evidently calculated to subvert the necessity of believing the articles of the Christian faith, and to justify all classes of schismatics or separatists from the Church. The convocation deemed these opinions so mischievous, that a committee was appointed to select propositions from Hoadly's books, and to procure their censure; but before his trial could take place, the convocation was prorogued by an arbitrary exercise of the royal authority, and has not been permitted to deliberate since. The temporal government, influenced by the schismatics, protected and advanced Hoadly and several persons of similar principles. In 1766, Archdeacon Blackburn, who was supposed to be an Arian, anonymously assailed the practice of subscribing the Articles; and in 1772 a body of clergy and laymen petitioned Parliament to put an end to it; but their request was refused. Many of these petitioners were secret disbelievers in some of the Christian doctrines.

The sect of Methodists had now become numerous. It was founded by Wesley and Whitfield, in the early part of this century. Originally, they designed only to assist the clergy in preaching to the poor in populous places; but they were gradually urged on to establish a sect. It was not, however, till after the death of Wesley that they pretended to administer the sacraments in their communities, and became absolutely separated from the Church.

about A.D. 1740.

A.D. 1791.

The Church had been suffering much for a long time from appointments to its offices made from unworthy motives. The bishoprics, and other dignities, were bestowed by the ministers of the crown on men distinguished only by birth or connexions. Patronage, in general, was distributed on low and worldly considerations. Theological learning received no encouragement; and active zeal was viewed with jealousy, as an approximation to Methodism. Prosperity had begun to inspire confidence, security, and sloth. The dangers of religion, arising from the French Revolution in 1789, which let loose an atheistic spirit throughout the world, stimulated the Church to renewed exertions. At the beginning of the present century, a great revival of religious zeal took place; numerous societies for various purposes connected with religion were instituted, and vigorously supported, though not always on principles accordant with those of the Church, as several of them evinced too great an intimacy with Dissenters.

The aspect of the times has since contributed to stimulate the activity of the Church. The weakness of the temporal government, and the influence which parties hostile to the Church have for the last twenty years exercised over it, have taught the Church to depend less on the protection of the state than on the Divine blessing on a zealous discharge of pastoral duties, especially by the inculcation of her own sound principles. The violent hostility which Dissenters and Romanists have for some time exhibited towards the Church

of England, and their avowed, though fruitless, intention and endeavours to destroy her, have likewise produced most salutary effects in promoting union, zeal, and attachment to her doctrines.

The Churches of IRELAND have been suffering severely from the persecution of Romanists for many years past. Let us now turn to the history of these Churches. I have already noticed the early independence of the Church of Ireland, which continued from the time of St. Patrick, in the fifth century, till the twelfth century, when a papal legate was appointed in Ireland, and the archbishops of Ireland for the first time received the pall from Rome in 1152. This Church shared the fate of others: it became infected with the prevalent superstitions. Henry VIII. caused the papal jurisdiction to be abolished in 1537 by the parliament. The bishops and clergy generally assented, and several reforms took place during this and the next reign. In the time of Mary, five of the bishops favourable to the Reformation were irregularly expelled from their sees; and the laws made against the pope were repealed. When Elizabeth succeeded, the former laws were revived, the papal power again rejected, and the royal supremacy and the English ritual again introduced. These regulations were approved by seventeen out of nineteen Irish bishops in the parliament of 1560, and by the rest of the bishops and clergy, who took the oath of supremacy, and remained in the possession of their benefices. The people also generally acquiesced, and continued to attend on divine service for several years. Two bishops only, out of about twenty-six, refused to acquiesce in the Reformation, and were driven from their sees, into which they had been intruded in the time of Mary, while the rightful bishops were still living. It may be here added, that in 1615 the Church of Ireland framed a formulary closely resembling the Articles of the Church of England; which last, however, were adopted as the confession of the Church of Ireland in the synod of Dublin, 1634, where also a body of canons was enacted.

The pope, of course, regarded these proceedings as highly sinful; and considering the Church of Ireland as schismatical, he resolved to induce the people to separate from it. Accordingly, he ordained Creagh, who had shown some diligence in exhorting the people to forsake the obedience of their bishops and the service of the Church, to the archbishopric of Armagh, although that see was already filled by the legitimate primate, Loftus. Creagh, who is styled by the Romish historians, "the principal propagator or restorer of the Catholic faith in Ireland," came over and perverted some of the people. The pope sent some other emissaries, and, in conjunction with the king of Spain, to whom he had given the dominions of Queen Elizabeth, excited the Irish chieftains and people to insurrection. In consequence, Ireland became the scene of war for thirty years, in which the bishops, Jesuits, and other priests sent by the pope, took a most active and leading part. In this war, numbers of the ignorant and savage people were exposed to the arts of the popish emissaries, and persuaded or forced to forsake the Church, as being favoured by the queen. Let me mention a few facts in corroboration of these statements. In 1575, one of the Irish lords, being engaged in plotting an insurrection against his sovereign Queen Elizabeth, went to Philip II., king of Spain, on whom Pope Pius V. had conferred the dominions of the queen, and sought assistance from him for the Irish Romanists. He then went to Rome, where, after some time, he obtained from the pope a pardon for all the bands of robbers who then infested Italy, on condition that they should undertake an expedition to Ireland for the exaltation of the see of Rome. An army thus composed was headed by a titular popish bishop of Killaloe in Ireland, and by the Jesuit Sanders; and they landed in Ireland not long after, bringing a bull from Pope Gregory XIII., in which all who should unite in rebellion against Queen Elizabeth were promised a plenary pardon of their sins. This expedition, however, entirely failed: but the same titular bishop, a few years afterwards,

is found introducing supplies of men, money, and arms from Spain for the relief of the insurgents. Another schismatic, assuming the title of archbishop of Armagh, came with orders from the King of Spain that the Irish should revolt; and having excited a rebellion, he fell in battle with the royal troops. Ohely, called archbishop of Tuam, was sent afterwards, by one of the Irish chieftains, to the King of Spain, whom he exhorted to invade and subdue Ireland. When the next insurrection broke out, we find Maceogan, a titular bishop and vicar of the Roman pontiff, issuing an excommunication against all who should give quarter to the prisoners taken from the queen's army. Maceogan caused all such persons to be put to death in his presence; and he himself at last fell in battle against the royal army, leading a troop of horse, with his sword in one hand, and his breviary and beads in the other!

The ignorance and superstition of the lower orders of the Irish at this time made them unhappily an easy prey to the emissaries of Rome, who came from Spain, Italy, and Flanders, and vehemently declaimed against the Churches of England and Ireland as heretical. Amongst the arguments used to delude this unhappy people, we find many lying wonders, visions, and miracles. It was said that on one occasion St. Columbkill took the form of a wolf, and carried a torch into the powder-magazine of a garrison of English "heretics," who were of course all destroyed. Another tale was, that a certain "heretic" converted a priest's vestment into a pair of trousers; but as soon as he had drawn them on, he took fire and was burned to ashes. An English governor, very much hated by the popish party, was said to have been heard conversing with the devil; presently after, an explosion was heard, and he was found lying frightfully distorted and insane, and soon after died. By such arguments were the Irish taught to hate their pastors, and to separate from their national Church. But all would have been insufficient, if the country had remained in peaceable subjection to its sove-

reign; and therefore the Popes Pius V. and Gregory XIII. promoted insurrections in Ireland against the royal authority; and the people were compelled by their chiefs to forsake the communion of their legitimate bishops, and to become obedient to the usurpers whom the popes sent over to occupy their places. It was only by a long series of rebellions that the schism in Ireland was consolidated and became so widely extended. The reign of Queen Elizabeth sufficed for this lamentable catastrophe.

King James I. wisely discouraged the Roman schism, and forbade the residence of its bishops, priests, and Jesuits, in his dominions; but under his successor, Charles I., a relaxation of this wholesome severity encouraged the schismatics to insult and disturb the Church, and ultimately, in 1641, to massacre in cold blood a hundred and fifty thousand of its adherents, and to break into insurrection.

The Church was now dreadfully persecuted by papists and by the English parliament; but on the return of Charles II. resumed its rights. Persecution was renewed under James II., in 1690, when the Romish party obtained power; and in the rebellion of 1798. From that period, the Romish party has acquired great political power, and the Church has been almost continually persecuted, especially within the last few years, in which the clergy have been reduced nearly to starvation; some have been murdered, and many placed in peril of their lives. To add to their afflictions, the government, in 1833, suppressed ten of the bishoprics, on pretence of requiring their revenues for the support of ecclesiastical buildings; although the bishops of Ireland, in a body, protested against such an act, and offered to pay the amount required from the incomes of their sees, provided that so great an injury were not done to the cause of religion.

Scotland, had also become subject to the pope about the twelfth century; but the Reformation was not so soon or so happily introduced there as in England. There is room for censure of both parties in that country during the sixteenth

century. The Romish party exercised cruelties on their opponents, which led to their own downfall. The reformed, headed by Knox, were turbulent and irregular in their proceedings. They at first adopted a temporary church government, which resembled the episcopal, and in 1572 agreed that bishops should be constituted; but soon afterwards, under the influence of Melville, who had imbibed a taste for the Genevan discipline, they rejected episcopacy, and established presbyterianism. In the beginning of the following century, these disorders ceased; and in 1612 the Church of Scotland was provided with lawful bishops and pastors, who were consecrated in England.

A.D. 1560.

A.D. 1580.

In 1638 the presbyterian party again became predominant, and took an oath or covenant to exterminate episcopal government. When Charles II. was restored, the Church again was protected by the state, and bishops were consecrated in England for all the vacant sees. A party of Covenanters, however, separated from the Church, esteeming episcopacy anti-Christian, and set up conventicles; and the Scottish bishops having scrupled to take the oaths of allegiance to King William, this monarch caused the bishops to be expelled from their sees, and episcopacy to be abolished by act of parliament; and recognised the sectarians as the established Church. From this time the bishops, and the rest of the Scottish Church, were most sorely and cruelly persecuted by the Presbyterians, till 1788, when the penal laws were repealed; but during this period they had been much reduced in numbers.

A.D. 1660.

A.D. 1690.

A flourishing branch of the Catholic Church, derived from England, exists in America. When Virginia, and other provinces of North America, were settled by the English, early in the seventeenth century, the Church took root there, and for a long time was supported by the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Efforts were often made

to obtain bishops for America, but they failed through the influence exerted by sectaries over the government. At length, after the United States had been declared independent, Dr. Seabury was ordained bishop of Connecticut, by the primus and bishops of Scotland; and other prelates were ordained for America, in England, in 1787 and 1790.* The American Church is now governed by twenty bishops, and is rapidly increasing. Bishops have also been consecrated for many of the British possessions in India, North America, and the West Indies; and the limits of those Churches are continually enlarging. Many of the heathen have been converted in India and North America.

A.D. 1784.

---

## CHAPTER XXIII.

### FRUITS OF FAITH IN THE BRITISH CHURCHES.

### A.D. 1530-1839.

Amongst that noble army of martyrs, who in the sixteenth century contended even to death for Christian truth, against Romish errors and superstitions, none merits a more conspicuous place than Nicholas Ridley, bishop of London. He was born in Northumberland, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, and studied at the University of Cambridge, where he was distinguished for learning and piety. He afterwards pursued his studies in theology at Paris and Louvain; and returning back again, was senior proctor of the University of Cambridge in 1533, when the decree was made by

*[The Romish episcopacy was introduced into the United States in 1789. The Methodists in America have a spurious episcopacy, derived from the pretended ordination of Dr. Thomas Coke, a presbyter, by John Wesley, another presbyter, in 1784. The United Brethren have also bishops residing in America.—Am. Ed.]

that university, as well as by all the Church of England, "that the bishop of Rome has not, by the word of God, any jurisdiction in this realm." He also became a celebrated preacher, and was remarkable for his knowledge of Scripture and the fathers; so that in 1537 Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, appointed him one of his chaplains, and associated him with his family. Soon after, being made vicar of Herne, he diligently instructed his flock in the doctrines of the Gospel, and his preaching attracted multitudes of people from all the surrounding country. In 1540 he was elected master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, where he had been educated, and where he had been a most diligent student of the Scriptures, as we may collect from the following words of his Farewell; where, apostrophising his college, he says, "In thy orchard (the walls, butts, and trees, if they could speak, would bear me witness,) I learned without book almost all Paul's epistles, and the canonical epistles too, save only the Apocalypse: of which study, although in time a great part did depart from me, yet the sweet smell thereof, I trust, I shall carry with me into heaven; for the profit thereof I think I have felt in all my life-time ever after."

About 1545 Ridley, by reading the book of Bertram,* a presbyter of the ninth century, was induced to forsake the erroneous opinion of transubstantiation; and he was instrumental in bringing Archbishop Cranmer and Bishop Latimer to the same mind. In 1547 he was consecrated bishop of Rochester, and was most zealous in promoting the reformation of abuses; but he evinced great firmness in resisting such measures as he judged injurious to the cause of justice or religion. When he was appointed, without his knowledge, on a royal commission, for the suppression of Clare Hall at Cambridge, and found, on examination, that this society would not dissolve itself, he wrote to the lord protector, declaring that his conscience would not permit him to act further in the commission; and thus incurred the risk of offending most griev-

* [Or Ratramn.—Am. Ed.]

ously the chief ruler of England. Such resolution was an earnest of that firmness and piety with which he afterwards faced death for his conscience towards God.

On the deposal of Bonner for contumacy, Ridley was installed bishop of London in his place. In this high station he behaved with great dignity, benevolence, mildness, and goodness. He was of a mortified spirit, given to prayer and contemplation, and useful and instructive to all his family. His day was divided between private prayers; family devotions, in which he every day gave a lecture on the New Testament, beginning with the Acts of the Apostles, and giving to every one who could read a copy of the Scriptures; the despatch of business; study in his private chamber; and useful discourse. He applied himself with all his power to reform the abuses in the disposal of Church patronage by the crown, and others which arose from a spirit of covetousness. Beholding with grief the distress of the poor in his city, who, in consequence of the suppression of monasteries, from which they had received much alms, were reduced to a state of sad destitution, he supplicated the king for a gift of the royal house at Bridewell as lodgings for these afflicted people, and succeeded in his application.

When that most pious young king, Edward VI., was afflicted with his last illness, Bishop Ridley was appointed to preach before him one day; and in his sermon much recommended charity as a duty incumbent on all men, but especially on those who are in high place and dignity, as well in respect to their great abilities, as because they were bound to give examples of goodness to others. The same day, the king sent for him, caused him to sit in a chair beside him, and would not permit him to remain uncovered. Then, after courteous thanks, he recapitulated the principal points of the sermon, and continued thus: "I took myself to be especially touched by your sermon, as well in regard to the abilities which God hath given me, as in regard of the example which of me he will require. For as in the kingdom I am next un-

der God, so must I most nearly approach him in goodness and mercy: for as our miseries stand most in need of help from him, so are we the greatest debtors, debtors to all that are miserable, and shall be the greatest accountants of our dispensation therein. And therefore, my lord, as you have given me (I thank you) this general exhortation, so direct me, I entreat you, by what particular actions I may this way best discharge my duties." The bishop remained silent for some time; and then weeping for joy, he besought his majesty for time to answer such a question; and having consulted the citizens of London, he returned again to the king, who gave the Grey-friars as an hospital for the support of infants, the aged, idiots, and cripples; St. Bartholomew's for wounded soldiers and sick persons; and Bridewell for the correction of idle and disorderly persons. These, with the hospital of St. Thomas, he richly endowed; and when he had signed the instrument to that effect, he, with reverent gesture and speech, thanked God for prolonging his life to finish that business.

Ridley's days of peace were now at an end. On the accession of the persecutor Mary, he was expelled from his bishopric, and committed to the Tower, where he spent his time in pious exercises and conference with his fellow prisoners, exhorting them to remain steadfast in maintaining the truth. "Resist the devil," he said, "and he will flee from you. Let us, therefore, resist him manfully; and, taking the cross upon our shoulders, let us follow our Captain Christ, who, by his own blood, hath dedicated and hallowed the way which leadeth unto the Father, that is, to the light which no man can attain,—the fountain of everlasting joys. Let us follow, I say, whither he calleth and allureth us, that after all these afflictions—which last but for a moment—whereby he trieth our faith as gold by the fire, we may everlastingly reign and triumph with him in the glory of his Father; and that through the same our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom with the Father and the Holy Ghost be all honour and glory now

and for ever. Amen. Amen." Such were the resolutions and the hopes of this venerable martyr in the contemplation of the sufferings which were preparing for him. His constancy was unshaken by any terrors, or by the instances of weakness which surrounded him. One of his own chaplains who then fell away, wrote to Ridley with a view to shake his resolution, and induce him to conform to the Romish errors. His reply affords a noble example of Christian faith and of apostolical admonition. "Sir, how nigh the day of my dissolution and departure out of this world is at hand, I cannot tell: the Lord's will be fulfilled, how soon soever it shall come. I know the Lord's words must be verified in me, that I shall appear before the incorrupt Judge, and be accountable to him for all my former life. And although the hope of his mercy is my sheet-anchor of eternal salvation, yet am I persuaded that whosoever wittingly neglecteth, and regardeth not to clear his conscience, he cannot have peace with God, nor a lively faith in his mercy. Conscience, therefore, moveth me, considering you were one of my family and one of my household, of whom then I think I had a special care; but, alas, now when the trial doth separate the chaff from the corn, how small a deal it is, God knoweth, which the wind doth not blow away;—this conscience, I say, doth move me to fear lest the lightness of my family should be laid to my charge, for lack of more earnest and diligent instruction which should have been done. But blessed be God, which hath given me grace to see this my default, and to lament from the bottom of my heart before my departing hence. This conscience doth move me also now to require both you and my friend Dr. Harvey to remember your promises made to me in times past, of the pure setting forth and preaching of God's word and his truth. These promises, although you shall not need to fear to be charged with them of me hereafter before the world, yet look for none other (I exhort you as my friends) but to be charged with them at God's hand. This conscience, and the love that I bear unto you, biddeth

me now say unto you both, in God's name, 'Fear God, and love not the world;' for God is able to cast both body and soul into hell fire; 'when his wrath shall suddenly be kindled, blessed are all they that put their trust in him.' And the saying of St. John is true, 'All that is in the world, as the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but of the world; and the world passeth away, and the lust thereof; but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.'" This admonition, so calm, so solemn, so affecting, produced such a powerful effect on the unhappy person to whom it was addressed, that he pined away with grief and remorse, and soon after died.

Ridley had been removed to Oxford, with his venerable fellow-prisoners Bishops Cranmer and Latimer, before he wrote this letter. In 1555 he and Latimer were examined by the papal delegates; and on their refusal to submit to the pope, were degraded from their orders; Ridley steadily refusing to move his cap, or show the least sign of submission or reverence to the usurped authority of the papal delegates. He, with Latimer, was then delivered to the temporal magistrates to be burned to death. The evening before his martyrdom, Ridley prepared himself for his departure with joy and triumph. He washed himself, and invited his friends and relations to be present at his "marriage" in the morning. His discourse melted into tears one of his most obdurate enemies who was present. Ridley said, "You love me not now, I see well enough; for in that you weep, it doth appear you will not be at my marriage, neither be content therewith. But quiet yourself; though my breakfast shall be somewhat sharp and painful, yet I am sure my supper shall be more pleasant and sweet."

In the morning, he approached the place of execution arrayed in a handsome black gown; and as he passed the prison of Bocardo, he looked to the chamber where Archbishop Cranmer was imprisoned, hoping to have seen and spoken to him; but he was engaged in disputing with Friar Soto

and others: but shortly behind him he saw and spoke to Latimer, who came clad in his shroud to be ready for the fire. When they came to the spot, he ran to Latimer, with a joyful countenance, embraced and kissed him, and comforted him, saying, "Be of good heart, brother; for God will either assuage the fury of the flame, or else strengthen us to abide it." Then turning to the stake, he kissed it, and kneeling down, prayed earnestly, as did Latimer likewise. Then rising, they conferred together for a little while. Dr. Smith preached the sermon usual on such occasions, to which the martyrs besought permission to reply; but were informed, that unless they recanted, they should not speak. "Well," replied the illustrious martyr, "so long as the breath is in my body, I will never deny my Lord Christ and his known truth; God's will be done in me." He then said, with a loud voice, "I commit my cause to Almighty God, who will judge all indifferently."

They were then ordered to make ready for burning, which they mildly obeyed. Ridley gave away several small things to persons standing by, many of whom were weeping. Latimer now stood in his shroud; and he who before, in an old coat and cap, seemed a withered and crooked old man, now roused to play the man, stood upright, and appeared a venerable and comely person. Ridley, standing in his shirt at the stake, lifted up his hands toward heaven, and prayed, "O heavenly Father, I give unto thee most hearty thanks, for that thou hast called me to be a professor of thee even unto death. I beseech thee, Lord God, take mercy upon the realm of England, and deliver the same from all her enemies." Then the smith fastened an iron chain round the bodies of both the martyrs, tying them to the stake. A faggot was now lighted and laid at Ridley's feet, when Latimer said, "Be of good comfort, master Ridley, and play the man. We shall this day light such a candle by God's grace in England, as, I trust, shall never be put out." When Ridley saw the fire flaming towards him, he cried with an exceeding loud voice,

"Into thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit; O Lord, receive my spirit." Latimer, on the other side, exclaimed, "O Father of heaven, receive my soul." Then he received the flame as if he were embracing it, and soon died, with but little appearance of pain.

But Ridley had to undergo dreadful and lingering tortures; for the fire on his side was so smothered by the quantity of faggots, that his legs were slowly consumed, while he cried to his tormentors to "let the fire come at him." But in all his agony, he still called on God, "Lord, have mercy upon me." At length the faggots were removed by one of the by-standers; and when the tortured martyr saw the fire flaming up, he wrenched himself to that side. And when the flame reached a bag of gunpowder which hung round his neck, he was seen to stir no more, but burned on the other side; and either from the chain loosing, or by the overpoise of his body after his legs were consumed, he fell over the chain down at Latimer's feet.

Thus died this illustrious martyr—or rather, thus did he enter eternal life; and it may be said with truth, that never, since the days of the apostles, was there a nobler manifestation of Christian faith and heroism. It was worthy of the brightest days of the primitive church; and not even Polycarp, in the amphitheatre of Smyrna, exceeded the glory of Nicholas Ridley.

Let us now pass to days when the righteous were no longer persecuted, and learning and piety were exposed to none but the ordinary trials.

Richard Hooker (usually called "judicious Hooker") was born near Exeter, about 1553, of parents remarkable for virtue and industry. From his childhood he was grave, desirous of learning; modest, and of so sweet and serene a quietness and meekness of nature, that many believed him to have an inward and blessed divine light. The seeds of sincere piety which his parents early instilled into his mind were so continually watered with the dews of God's bles-

sed Spirit, that his infant virtues grew into such holy habits, as made him daily more in favour both with God and man.

About 1567, when Dr. Jewel, that celebrated opponent of Romish errors, was bishop of Salisbury, the parents of Hooker being unable to defray the expense of an university education for their son, this learned bishop, being made acquainted with the circumstance, and having examined and observed the boy's knowledge and behaviour, procured for him a maintenance at Corpus Christi College, in the University of Oxford. Here he continued for several years, still increasing in learning and prudence, and so much in humility and piety, that he seemed to be filled with the Holy Ghost. In 1571 he experienced the loss of his kind friend and patron, Bishop Jewel, who died, as he had lived, in devout meditation and prayer; but soon after, Edwin Sandys, bishop of London, who had heard from Jewel of Hooker's great merits and learning, placed his son under his tuition. While Hooker was a student in the university, so great was his devotion, that in four years he was but twice absent from the chapel-prayers. His behaviour there was such as showed an awful reverence of that God whom he there worshipped, giving all outward testimonies that his affections were set on heavenly things. He was never known to be angry, passionate, or extreme in his desires; never heard to repine or dispute with Providence; but by a quiet, gentle submission of his will to the wisdom of his Creator, bore the burden of the day with patience. He was never heard to utter an uncomely word; and by this, and his grave behaviour, he caused a reverence towards his person even from those that elsewhere cast off all strictness of behaviour. In 1577 he became a fellow of his college; and two years after was appointed by the chancellor of the university to read the Hebrew lecture. In 1584 he was appointed to the parsonage of Drayton Beauchamp, in Buckinghamshire; and in the next year, through the recommendation of his friend Sandys, archbishop of York, was made master of the Temple in London.

At this time the Church had been for some years exceedingly troubled by the schismatical proceedings of the Puritans, who declaimed against all her rites and ceremonies as popish and anti-Christian. Of this party was one Travers, who had been irregularly ordained abroad by some persons who were not of the degree of bishops, and who now ministered as lecturer of the Temple, though the law of the English Church prohibited such persons from acting as ministers. Travers, who had himself aspired to be master of the Temple, opposed Hooker's doctrines in the pulpit, and afterwards petitioned the privy council, charging him with many errors, especially for his charitable opinion, that many of our forefathers, who lived in the times of superstition, were saved; but Archbishop Whitgift, whom Queen Elizabeth intrusted with the entire management of ecclesiastical affairs, had such good testimonies of Hooker's principles, learning, and moderation, that all solicitations against him were of no effect. A.D. 1583-1604.

Though Travers was obliged to leave the Temple, he had several supporters there, who rendered Hooker's position very uneasy. To bring them to a better mind, he resolved to write his celebrated books on the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity; and finding that his situation did not afford sufficient leisure, he left it for the parish of Boscum, near Salisbury, where the first four books were written, and made public in 1594. Another book was published in 1597. It is recorded that when a part of this celebrated work had been translated for the pope, he said, "There is no learning that this man hath not searched into; nothing too hard for his understanding. This man indeed deserves the name of an author: his books will get reverence by age, for there are in them such seeds of eternity, that if the rest be like this, they shall last till the last fire shall consume all learning."

In 1595 he was appointed to the vicarage of Bishopsborne, in Kent, in which place he continued his customary rules of mortification and self-denial, fasted often, was frequent in

meditation and prayer, enjoying those blessed returns which only such men feel and know. Before long, his writings, and the innocency and sanctity of his life, became so remarkable, that many persons came from all parts to see him. His habit was usually coarse and mean; his appearance lowly, and accordant with the humility of his soul; his body was wasted, not with age, but with study and holy mortifications. He here forsook all the pleasures and allurements of the world, possessing his soul in a virtuous quietness, which he maintained by constant study, prayer, and meditation. He preached every Sunday morning, and in the evening catechised his parishioners. His sermons were not long, but delivered with a grave zeal; they were addressed to the reason, and abounded in apt illustrations. He fasted strictly in Ember-week, when he usually retired into the church for many hours, and did the same on most Fridays and other days of fasting. He was most diligent in visiting the sick, exhorting them to confession of their sins and repentance.

While Hooker was thus engaged in all the exercises of piety, and was also preparing the last books of his Ecclesiastical Polity, he fell into a long and sharp illness, and began to fail. A few days before his death, the pious Dr. Saravia, prebendary of Canterbury, who knew the very secrets of his soul, (for they were supposed to confess their sins to each other,) came to him, and after a conference on the safety and benefit of the Church's absolution, it was resolved that Saravia should administer that and the holy eucharist the following day. When the time came, they retired for a short while from the company, and then returned, when Hooker received the blessed sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; which being performed, Saravia thought he saw a reverend gaiety and joy in his face; but it lasted not long, for his bodily infirmities returned with violence. The next day he found Hooker better in appearance, but deep in contemplation, and not inclined to converse. When he was asked the subject of his thoughts, he replied, "that he was meditating the number

and nature of angels, and their blessed obedience and order, without which peace could not be in heaven; and O that it might be so on earth!" After which he said, "I have lived to see this world is made up of perturbations, and I have been long preparing to leave it, and gathering comfort for the dreadful hour of making my account with God, which I now apprehend to be near; and though I have, by his grace, loved him in my youth, and feared him in my age, and laboured to have a conscience void of offence to him and to all men, yet if thou, Lord, be extreme to mark what I have done amiss, who can abide it? And therefore, where I have failed, Lord, show mercy unto me; for I plead not my righteousness, but the forgiveness of my unrighteousness, for His merits who died to purchase pardon for penitent sinners; and since I owe thee a death, Lord, let it not be terrible, and then take thine own time, I submit to it: let not mine, O Lord, but let thy will be done." He then fell into a dangerous slumber, and awaking once more said, "God hath heard my daily petitions, for I am at peace with all men, and he is at peace with me; and from that blessed assurance I feel that inward joy which this world can neither give nor take from me; my conscience beareth me this witness, and this witness makes the thoughts of death joyful. I could wish to live to do the Church more service, but cannot hope it; for my days are past as a shadow that returns not." Thus speaking, his spirit failed, and the holy man slept in Jesus Christ. A.D. 1600.

Nicholas Ferrar, a holy deacon of the Church, was descended from an ancient and noble family, and was born in London in 1592. His parents educated him in the paths of piety and virtue, and his progress in learning was rapid. His disposition was grave, and he early showed a dislike of any thing that savoured of worldly vanity. In his apparel he wished to be neat, but refused any thing that was not simple and plain. He was good-natured and tender-hearted in the highest degree, and so fearful of offending any one, that he

would weep abundantly on the least apprehension of having done so. In his fourteenth year he went to study at the University of Cambridge, and was eminently distinguished there by his abilities and learning; so that his tutor used to say of him, "May God keep him in a right mind! for if he should turn schismatic or heretic, he would make work for all the world."

His health becoming much impaired, he was advised to travel, and in 1612 went abroad in the train of the Princess Elizabeth and the Palsgrave. He then studied at the Universities of Leipsic and Padua. After visiting Rome and many parts of the continent, he returned to England in 1618; and soon after became actively engaged in the affairs of a great company for colonising Virginia in America, of which he was chosen deputy-governor; and in this situation he displayed the greatest ability in defending the company from the intrigues of Gondomar, the Spanish ambassador. While he was thus engaged, the excellence of his conduct induced an opulent merchant of London to offer him in marriage his only daughter, a young lady of great beauty and accomplishments, with a large fortune: but Ferrar replied with many thanks, declining so honourable an offer; "for if God," said he, "will give me grace to keep a resolution long since formed, I have determined to lead a single life; and after having discharged to the best of my ability my duty to the company and to my family as to worldly concerns, I seriously purpose to devote myself to God, and to go into a religious retirement."

On the dissolution of the Virginia company, he was elected a member of parliament, where he was highly distinguished for eloquence and ability, and was appointed to draw up the charge against the Earl of Middlesex, lord treasurer, for his conduct in the affairs of the Virginia company. Nicholas Ferrar was now at leisure to carry into execution his plan of a religious life. He accordingly retired to Little Gidding, in Huntingdonshire, accompanied by his mother and breth-

ren, whom he had persuaded to follow his example, and several friends, to the number altogether of near forty. He was now twenty-seven years of age; and in order to carry on his religious plans by his own personal assistance, he resolved to become a deacon. This wish was communicated by a friend to Laud, bishop of St. David's, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, who ordained him a deacon in 1626; after which he signed a vow, that since God had so often heard his most humble petitions, and delivered him out of many dangers, and in many desperate calamities had extended his mercy to him, he would therefore now give himself up continually to serve God to the utmost of his power in the office of a deacon, into which office he had that morning been regularly ordained; that he had long ago seen enough of the manners and of the vanities of the world, and that he did hold them all in so low esteem, that he was resolved to spend the remainder of his life in mortifications, in devotion and charity, and in a constant preparation for death.

Some high nobles at court, who knew his virtues, hearing that he had been ordained, immediately offered him some ecclesiastical benefices of great value; but these he refused with steadiness and humility, saying that he did not think himself worthy. He added, that his fixed determination was to rise no higher in the Church than the place and office which he now possessed, and which he had undertaken only with the view to be legally authorised to give spiritual assistance, according to his abilities, to his family and others with whom he might be concerned; that as to temporal affairs, he had now parted with all his worldly estate, and divided it amongst his family; that he earnestly besought his honoured friends to accept his sincere thanks for their good opinion of him, for whose prosperity, both in this world and a better, he would never cease to pray.

The parish church, which was close to the manor-house of Gidding, had fallen into decay, and divine service had been discontinued in consequence of the depopulation of the par-

ish; it was now repaired and beautified at the expense of Ferrar's mother, a pious and holy woman. The house itself was very large, and Ferrar allotted one room as an oratory for the devotions of the whole family, besides two separate oratories for the men and women at night. His own lodgings were so contrived, that he could conveniently see that every thing was conducted with decency and order. He established a school close to the house, and provided masters for the free instruction of all the children who came from the neighbouring towns. He was very diligent in catechising the children of the neighbourhood, and caused them to learn the Psalter by heart. Every Sunday, after morning service, these children, more than one hundred in number, were hospitably entertained by the religious society at Gidding. Whilst dinner was serving, they sang a hymn to the organ; then grace was said by the clergyman of the parish; and during dinner a chapter in the Bible, together with some histories of the saints and martyrs, were read. After evening service, all the society went into their oratory, when select portions of the Psalms were repeated. After this, they were at liberty till eight o'clock, when the bell again summoned them to the oratory, where they sang a hymn to the organ and went to prayers; and then all retired to their private apartments. On the first Sunday in every month they received the holy communion.

On week-days they rose at four in the morning; at five went to prayers in the oratory; at six said the Psalms of the hour,—for every hour had its appointed Psalm, with some portion of the Gospel; then they sang a hymn, repeated some passages of Scripture, and at half-past six went to church to matins. At seven they said the Psalms of the hour, sang a hymn, and went to breakfast. At ten they went to church to litany; at eleven to dinner, during which Scripture and pious books were read aloud. They went to evening prayers in the church at four; after which came supper and recreations till eight, at which time they prayed in their ora-

tory. During the night there was a continual vigil or watching, in which several of the men and women, in their respective oratories, repeated the whole Psalter, together with prayers for the life of the king and his sons, from nine at night till one in the morning. The time of this watch being ended, they awoke Nicholas Ferrar, who constantly rose at one o'clock, and betook himself to religious meditation, according to these words, "At midnight will I rise and give thanks." Ferrar himself lay upon a skin stretched on the floor, arrayed in a loose frieze gown; and he watched in the oratory or the church three nights in the week. Several religious persons, both from the neighbourhood and from distant parts of the country, attended these vigils, and practised them elsewhere. The leisure hours of this holy society were devoted to the instruction of the poor, the dispensation of alms and medicines to the sick, and the composition of a harmony of the Gospels. Ferrar himself wrote several valuable religious treatises, and compiled lives of saints.

In 1631, Dr. Williams, bishop of Lincoln, the diocesan, came to visit Ferrar, when he had an opportunity of seeing his way of serving God, and of examining the rules for watching, fasting, praying, psalmody, readings, almsgiving, and all other points established in this society; all of which he highly approved, and bade them in God's name to proceed. Some years after, he again visited Gidding; and, to honour the society, gave notice that he would preach in their church, where an immense multitude of people assembled to hear him. In his sermon he enlarged most on what it was to "die unto the world:" all tended to approve the dutiful and severe life of the Ferrars, and of the Church that was in their house.

King Charles I. held Nicholas Ferrar in great reverence, and came more than once to visit this religious society; and having perused the Harmony of the Gospels which they had compiled, he was so much pleased with it, that he requested them to prepare a copy for his own peculiar use.

In 1637 the strength of Ferrar began rapidly to fail; but he experienced no bodily pain. He conversed with his friends, exhorting them to persevere in the way he had pointed out to them; and after expressing his conviction that sad times were coming on the Church, and lamenting the sufferings which they would have to endure, he received the holy eucharist; and as the clock struck one at night, the hour at which for so many years he had constantly risen to worship God, he departed this life in a rapturous ecstacy of devotion. The society over which he had presided was persecuted and dispersed during the great rebellion, which shortly afterwards broke out, and in which the King and the Archbishop of Canterbury, the friends of this holy man, were put to death by the Presbyterians and Independents.

Henry Hammond was born in 1605, at Chertsey in Surrey; and was so early blessed with the grace of piety, that, even while he was a boy at Eton, he would retire from his playfellows into places of privacy to pray to God. He was remarkable for sweetness of disposition, and early proficiency in learning; so that, when only thirteen years of age, he was sent to the University of Oxford, where he became a fellow of Magdalen College, and studied thirteen hours a day. In a few years he had read most of the classic writers, fathers, councils, and schoolmen, besides the holy Scriptures. In 1629 he was elevated to the holy order of priesthood; and in 1633 he was appointed rector of Penshurst in Kent. He now devoted himself to his parochial duties, preaching diligently, offering up the daily sacrifice of prayer for his people, administering the sacraments, relieving the poor, keeping hospitality, reconciling differences among neighbours, visiting the sick, and catechising youth. He was also frequently called to preach at Paul's Cross in London; was a member of convocation, archdeacon of Chichester; and was engaged in every holy and good work of his ministry, when the rebellion broke out; and an attempt having been made in favour of the king in that neighbour-

A.D. 1643.

hood, which Hammond was supposed to have encouraged, he was obliged to escape to Oxford, where he lay concealed for some time, and wrote many excellent works in defence of true religion and the discipline of the Church, against the heresies and schisms then so prevalent. He afterwards disputed publicly against the sectarians, and was made canon of Christ Church, and chaplain to his majesty King Charles I. Hammond attended the king during his imprisonment until 1647, when all his majesty's attendants were removed from about his person. After this Hammond was himself cast into prison by the Parliamentarians, where he commenced his Commentary on the New Testament, and his famous work in Defence of Episcopacy against Blondel.

He was never married, though he had some intentions of entering into that state; but was deterred by the aspect of the times, and by recollecting the apostle's advice (1 Cor. vii. 26.) His habits of chastity and modesty at all times were remarkable. His self-denial was so great, that he seldom eat more than once in twenty-four hours. He was perfectly indifferent as to the quality of his food. In sleep he was so temperate that he rarely slept more than four or five hours in the night. He was never idle, but always engaged in something useful. In devotion he has rarely been exceeded: besides occasional and supernumerary addresses, his certain perpetual returns of prayer exceeded David's "seven times a day;" and even the night was not without its office, the fifty-first Psalm being his designed midnight entertainment. In his prayers, his attention was not only fixed and steady, but his fervour was so great, that frequently his transport threw him prostrate upon the earth. His tears also would interrupt his words; and this not merely in his private prayers, but in the common service of the Church. So great was his spirit of forgiveness, that, having been most cruelly and maliciously treated by some persons, he had a peculiar daily prayer purposely for them. From his friends he particularly sought to learn his faults and offences, and even his

failings in discretion and wisdom. His alms, even when he was reduced to the greatest distress, were very abundant. He not only sought for the neighbouring poor, but assisted students at the universities, and the clergy who had been expelled from their parishes, or driven into exile, by the sectaries. Though he was very unwilling to be interrupted in his studies by any concerns of his own, he never kept any one waiting, but would immediately come to any visitor, more especially when he was informed that a poor man wished to speak to him.

After he was released from prison, he retired to Worcestershire, where he continued his labours in the cause of religion; and, when King Charles II. was restored to the throne of his ancestors, Hammond was designed to fill the vacant see of Worcester; but as he was on his way to London, he was seized with illness, and after suffering dreadful pains with all the patience, submission, and piety which might have been expected from so holy and useful a life, he departed to his eternal reward in the fifty-fifth year of his age.

A.D. 1660.

Thomas Wilson, bishop of Sodor and Man, was born in Cheshire, in 1663, and educated at the University of Dublin, where he intended to practise medicine, but was persuaded by a pious archdeacon to undertake the sacred ministry. In 1686 he was ordained deacon, and appointed to a curacy in Lancashire; and in 1689 he was raised to the priesthood, on which solemn occasion he again dedicated himself to the service of his Lord and Master, and formed the most solemn resolutions of living more than ever to the glory of that Saviour "who loved him, and gave himself for him." In conformity with these resolutions, he discharged his sacred duties with indefatigable zeal; "holiness to the Lord" was inscribed on every part of his conduct. The lustre of such a character could not long be concealed; and he was selected by the Earl of Derby to be his chaplain, and the preceptor of his son. After some time, observing with

A.D. 1692.

deep regret the embarrassed state of his patron's affairs, caused by habits of profusion and inattention to domestic economy, he felt it his duty to remonstrate with the earl on his conduct; and he so judiciously and wisely managed this delicate affair, that ere long he had the great satisfaction of seeing his noble friend relieved from his embarrassments, and a train of distressed tradesmen and dependents effectually relieved.

The bishopric of Sodor and Man had been vacant from the year 1693, and Lord Derby, to whom the appointment belonged as lord of the Isle of Man, offered it to his chaplain. He thankfully acknowledged the honour intended him, but declared himself unworthy of so high an office, and incapable of so arduous an undertaking; and it was only after the see had been vacant for four years, and the metropolitan had complained to the king on the subject, that Wilson was at last "forced into the see." He was consecrated in 1697. Bishop Wilson now devoted himself most zealously to the duties of the episcopate. He felt that he had been called by Divine appointment to this arduous station, and was persuaded that every necessary help would be afforded him. He was frequent in prayer, and thence derived the skill and grace which appeared in his ministry. His life, indeed, was a life of prayer. By his frequent intercourse with Heaven, he became heavenly in his temper, his views, and his whole conversation.

The temporal and spiritual state of his diocese called for most vigorous exertions. He was obliged to rebuild the episcopal mansion, which had fallen into decay, and to effect many other expensive repairs. He lamented that this forced him in some degree to intermit his charity to the poor. His attention was directed to whatever could in any degree promote the spiritual and temporal welfare of the country. He was seen in every quarter of his diocese, counselling, guiding, and directing. His charity was always most abundant. When he possessed, early in life, only 30*l.* per annum, he de-

voted one tenth of this income to the poor. As his income gradually increased, a greater share was distributed in alms. He always laid aside the proportion destined for the poor in a certain place. In this treasury, which he named "the poor's drawer," was deposited at first a tenth, then a fifth, afterwards a third, and at last half his income. Every deposit there was converted into an act both of charity and devotion; prayers and alms were incessantly united. At his house every kind of distress found relief. Whether the hungry or the naked applied, their claims were certain to be duly considered and liberally answered. In his barn was always a provision of corn and meal for the indigent; and the good bishop gave orders to his steward when corn was measured to the poor never to stroke it, as was usual, but to give heaped measure. His demesne contained several manufactories of different sorts, where artisans were engaged in preparing garments for the poor. The bishop attended even to the smallest circumstances which could benefit his people. He would purchase quantities of spectacles, and distribute them amongst the aged poor, that they might be enabled to read their Bibles.

Bishop Wilson was unwearied in his endeavours to improve the parochial schools. He was a constant and earnest preacher, and during the fifty-eight years of his episcopate he never failed every Sunday to preach or celebrate the holy rites of the Church, except when prevented by illness. Nothing could exceed his care and diligence in obtaining an effective and pious clergy. From the moment that any student declared his intention of entering the sacred ministry, the bishop formed a close connection with him, watched over his conduct, and guided his studies and pursuits. After his entrance on the sacred ministry, the bishop made him reside with him for a whole year, that he might exercise a more minute inspection, and administer daily instruction and advice. He held many synods of the clergy, in which several wise constitutions and canons of discipline were made and enforced. He frequently addressed his clergy in pastoral

letters full of piety and wisdom; and so great was the veneration in which they held him, that half a century after his decease, aged clergy have been heard to recount the virtues of Bishop Wilson with tears of affection trembling in their eyes. Bishop Wilson acquired a knowledge of the Manks language, into which he translated several pious books, and procured the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles to be translated into that language.

Bishop Wilson was a man of prayer. He not only prayed every morning at six o'clock with his family, and also in the evening, but he retired three times every day to his private devotions. Even in the night he might be heard engaged in prayer. Sometimes the words of the Psalmist were indistinctly heard by his attendants. "I will arise at midnight, and give thanks unto thee. Praise the Lord, O, my soul; and all that is within me, praise his holy name." Sometimes parts of the *Te Deum* were recognised. Such were the nightly orisons of this holy man. Words of instruction and consolation were continually flowing from his lips; so that it was scarcely possible to enjoy his society even for a short time without growing wiser and better. His actions, however, spoke more forcibly than language; the beauty of holiness shone forth in all his conversation, irradiated his countenance, and gave a peculiar charm to every thing he said or did.

In 1722, the bishop, in the discharge of his duty as the guardian of the sacraments, forbade the governor's wife to approach the holy table, as a punishment for a very scandalous calumny which she had disseminated. A clergyman having disobeyed this injunction of the bishop, he was suspended; and the result was, that the bishop was illegally seized and imprisoned, with his two vicars-general. During this affliction, the bishop was occupied in prayer and meditation, and in plans for the advancement of his Master's Kingdom. The poor were loud in their lamentations; and being indignant at the injustice practised towards their beloved pastor, they were

about to level the governor's house to the ground, when they were restrained by the voice of their bishop, who spoke to them from his prison, and exhorted them to peace and submission. At length he was released on appeal to the king. The day of his release was one of universal rejoicing. The multitudes extended for three miles in length, scattering flowers beneath his feet, to the sound of music and loud rejoicings. Bishop Wilson's strictness in observing ecclesiastical discipline may be collected from the circumstances alrealy alluded to.

At length he was to be called away to his reward in heaven. He beheld the approach of death with peace and calmness, but with the deepest humility. Shortly before his death, a crowd of poor people were assembled in the hall to receive his blessing and alms, when he was overheard saying "God, be merciful to me a sinner, a vile sinner, a miserable sinner!" He fell into delirium some weeks before his decease, but his dreams were filled with visions of angels. He died in 1755, in the ninety-third year of his age.

It would be easy to add many other instances of Christian piety from the records of the Church in the period now before us. The learning and sanctity of Usher, of Bedel, Andrews, Beveridge, Bull, would have done honour to the best days of Christianity. In recent times, the spirit of missionary zeal has again revived, and the venerable Societies for the Propagation of the Gospel, and for Promoting Christian Knowledge, have enlarged the spheres of their operations. The foundation of these societies is chiefly to be attributed to the pious zeal of Dr. Thomas Bray, who, at the end of the seventeenth century, was appointed by the Bishop of London as his commissary in Maryland, America; and who, on his return, established the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. This excellent Society has for a long series of years devoted itself to the maintenance of Christian missions in North

A.D. 1701.

America, and other possessions of the British crown. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge had been established in 1698; and from that period to the present time it has laboured for the benefit of the Church, in circulating the Scriptures and religious books, in contributing to the assistance of distressed churches, and in maintaining missions to the heathen, especially in India. Nor would it be just, in this place, to omit all mention of the Church Missionary Society, which has been formed within the present century, and which has contributed much to the spread of the Christian faith amongst the heathen, especially in the islands of the Southern Ocean. A.D. 1800.

---

## CHAPTER XXIV.

### ON THE ROMAN CHURCHES.

### A.D. 1517-1839.

The Churches which either voluntarily or by compulsion remained under the papal jurisdiction, and rejected the Reformation, were those of Italy, Spain, Austria, Poland, Hungary, Bohemia, France, and part of Germany and Switzerland. The conduct of the pope towards the Lutheran and Reformed has already been noticed, together with the assembling of the council of Trent. This famous synod, which in many of its sessions consisted of about forty or fifty bishops, had at last nearly two hundred. It closed in 1563, having decided in favour of purgatory, transubstantiation, and some other erroneous opinions, which it declared articles of faith; and approved of invocation of saints, honouring of relics, communion in one kind, the celibacy of the clergy, &c. Certain opinions, universally prevalent at that time in the Roman Churches, obliged their members to receive all

the decrees of this synod implicitly and without any discussion or examination. One great party believed the pope infallible; the remainder held that a general council was infallible; consequently, both agreed that a general council, approved by a pope, (as the council of Trent was) must be infallible, and that whoever differed from it must be a heretic. All this was widely different from the notions and the practice of primitive times, when the decrees of councils were examined and judged by the universal Church, and derived their full authority only from *universal consent.* And hence it appears that the decrees of Trent were only those of the bishops assembled there, not the deliberate judgments of the whole Roman Church, and still less the judgments of the whole catholic or universal Church. Under the same erroneous opinions alluded to above, the Roman Churches refrained from communicating with the Reformed Churches and communities, and engaged in vehement controversies with them, which have not yet ceased. These controversies were for a long time chiefly managed by a learned and artful society, called the Jesuits, who were founded by a Spaniard, named Ignatius Loyola, and who soon became the principal agents of the popes, and the chief support of their power.

A.D. 1537.

The Roman Churches, soon after the council of Trent, became much divided amongst themselves on the questions of Divine grace, of the authority of councils compared with that of popes, and of the immaculate conception of the Virgin. In these disputes the different parties went so far as to charge their adversaries with heresy. It would occupy too large a space to detail these disputes and divisions; but the doctrines of Jansenius, bishop of Ipres, which were made public in 1640, led to infinite divisions and uneasiness in the Roman Churches. These doctrines, which approximated to those of Calvin, were assailed with vehemence by the Jesuits and the popes. But it was in vain that Urban VIII., Innocent X., Alexander VII.,

A.D. 1642-1713.

and Clement XI., fulminated censures, excommunications, bulls, rescripts, briefs, &c., against the Jansenists. In vain were subscriptions required to formularies condemning their doctrines, and every ingenious device put in force to get rid of this party. All was fruitless—the Jansenists continued to hold their benefices in the Roman Churches, and in the earlier half of last century a number of the French bishops were of that party. Jansenism has ever since more or less disturbed the Roman communion.

With Jansenism a reforming spirit arose, which produced a variety of innovations. In Germany, about 1760, many theologians decried the papal authority, which they wished to reduce within the narrowest limits; and taught that several of the common practices and opinions were superstitious. The Emperor Joseph II., who began to reign in 1781, acted on these principles, suppressed monasteries, forbade papal dispensations, regulated ceremonies, favoured the Jansenists, removed images from the churches, suppressed some episcopal sees, and assumed the patronage of all the bishoprics in Lombardy which had belonged to the popes. Pius VI. in vain opposed these proceedings; they became embodied in the laws of Austria; and the churches within that empire, in Germany and Italy, are more under the temporal power than under the pope. In various parts of Germany the Romish clergy condemn the celibacy of the clergy and communion in one kind, and celebrate divine service in German. The conduct of Joseph II. was imitated in Tuscany by the Archduke Leopold,* (who forbade all appeal to the popes,) and in Naples, Parma, Portugal. A number of monasteries were suppressed by the King of Sicily in 1776. In Holland the Jansenists have had bishops of their own since 1723, who claim to be members of the Roman Church, though the popes will not recognise them as such.

The most vehement opponents of the Jansenists were the

* [With the advice and aid of the learned and pious Scipio de Ricci, bishop of Pistoia, nephew of the last General of the Order of Jesuits.—Am. Ed.]

Jesuits, already alluded to, who chiefly engaged in the defence of the Roman Church against its opponents, in the education of youth, and in the dissemination of Christianity in heathen lands. The leading members of this society were bound by an oath to go wherever the pope should think fit to send them. Their perfect internal discipline; their entire obedience to their general (thus the head of the order was termed;) the art with which they adapted their instructions to every class of people; the consummate ability, learning, and judgment which they displayed; soon rendered them the most powerful and opulent of the monastic orders. They became the grand bulwark of the papacy, supporting all its claims with unwearied assiduity. The facility with which they relaxed the moral system of Christianity, and accommodated it to the propensities of mankind, rendered them exceedingly popular as spiritual advisers and confessors in the courts of princes, and amongst the wealthy and noble. They soon obtained exclusive dominion in these high places. For a century after the foundation of this society, all the most eminent theologians of the Roman communion were found amongst its members. The names of Salmeron, Lainez, Bellarmine, Vasquez, Petavius, and many others, might be mentioned in illustration of this.

The characteristics of the Jesuits were craft and subtilty. They were perfectly unscrupulous in the use of means for the accomplishment of their ends. Evasions, mental reservations, equivocations, were openly defended and unblushingly practised; even direct falsehood was employed, whenever it was imagined to be necessary for the interests of their cause. These dangerous principles and practices of Jesuitism were most ably exposed by the celebrated Pascal, in the *Provincial Letters*, about the middle of the seventeenth century. This powerful and wealthy society, however, was at last destined to fall.

About the year 1760, their evil practices and political intrigues having excited universal jealousy, the French parlia-

ment supressed the order of Jesuits, in spite of the remonstrances of the pope and bishops. They were soon after suppressed by the civil power in Spain, Portugal, Italy, &c.; and, in fine, the order was extinguished by Pope Clement XIV. This was a grievous blow to the papacy, of which the Jesuits were most devoted partisans. In the course of the present century, this dangerous order has been revived by Pope Pius VII., and is beginning again to trouble the Church.* A.D. 1773. A.D. 1814.

A spirit of infidelity had long been spreading itself in France and other parts of the continent, under the influence of Voltaire, D'Alembert, and others. Many of these infidels were members, and even clergy, of the Roman churches. In 1789 the French Revolution broke out, and led to the immediate suppression of monasteries, and the destruction of Church property. The Gallican Church was then re-organised by the power of the republic; all the bishops were driven from their sees, in consequence of their refusing to acquiesce in this alteration, by which the number of bishoprics was reduced more than one half, and the papal power suppressed. A body of new bishops were then appointed, and consecrated by Talleyrand, bishop of Autun. Before long, several of these Gallican bishops declared themselves atheists, and renounced the worship of God. All religion was then proscribed. When Buonaparte became first consul, he negotiated for the restoration of the Church with Pope Pius VII., and the latter, in consequence, insisted on all the old royalist bishops and the constitutional prelates resigning their sees. On the refusal of many of the former, he declared their consent needless, annihilated 159 bishoprics, and created in their place 60 new ones. Buonaparte then enacted laws, A.D. 1792. A.D. 1801.

* [It is spreading itself both openly and secretly in the United States of America, and with its wonted policy seeming to adapt itself to the institutions of the country, while by getting the control of education, it prepares to modify and direct those institutions at its will.—Am. Ed.]

placing the new Gallican Church entirely under the control of government, as it continues to be to the present day. The adherents of the deprived bishops declared these acts schismatical, and they form a distinct communion from the rest of the Roman Church. Some years afterwards, Buonaparte extinguished the temporal power of the pope; which, however, was restored again at the peace in 1814.

The monasteries were also suppressed in France, Italy, Germany; and in the course of the last few years, they have been suppressed in Spain and Portugal by the temporal rulers in those countries. The pope has now entirely lost that temporal power over the princes of Europe, which in the middle ages filled the world with confusion. The recent acts of the King of Prussia, in imprisoning some bishops who had violated the laws, and their own engagements, with reference to marriages between persons of different communions, would a few centuries since have been followed by his deposition from the throne, and the proclamation of a crusade against him.

The limits of the Roman Churches were much enlarged about the time of the Reformation by the conquests of the Portuguese and Spanish in the east and west. A great number of converts from heathenism in the east were made by the pious zeal of Francis Xavier, who sailed for the Portuguese settlements in India, and in a very short time succeeded in spreading the Christian religion throughout that vast country and the adjoining islands. In 1549 he went to Japan, and established there numerous churches, which continued to flourish for many years, until they were brought into persecution, and destroyed by the intrigues of the Jesuits. He died in 1552, as he was about to attempt the conversion of the Chinese; but after his death, Matthew Ricci, and other Jesuits, penetrated into that empire; and having made themselves very acceptable to the emperor by their skill in science, they were permitted to instruct the people in the Christian religion; and thus the foundation of the

A.D. 1542.

church was laid amongst the Chinese, which still continues, under much persecution, to exist among them. The Nestorians of St. Thomas were also forced to unite themselves with the Roman Church by Menezes, archbishop of Goa. Christianity, which was now introduced into South America by the Spanish and Portuguese, obtained numerous converts there, and took deep and permanent root. A.D. 1599.

The synod of Trent reformed some of the grosser abuses in discipline; but its canons of discipline were not universally received. The controversies with the advocates of reformation led to some amelioration of doctrine amongst the well-informed members of the Roman Church. In the seventeenth century it became their object to represent their doctrines in the form which was most moderate, most conformable to Scripture, and most approximating to the tenets of the Reformation. One object in this new system of argument was to convict the Protestants of schism in voluntarily forsaking the communion of the Church,—an offence which was imputed to them by their antagonists, and too often admitted by themselves, in direct opposition to the facts of history. This mode of argument, however—in the hands of the celebrated Roman theologians Bossuet and Veron—had the effect of producing sounder and more moderate views on many subjects in the Romish Church itself, though it is unhappily but too certain that the great mass of that community are still involved in superstitions and errors very injurious to true religion. The principles of morality have also become very much relaxed amongst them by the influence of the Jesuits; and the system of questioning adopted at confession seems calculated for the dissemination of vice.

## CHAPTER XXV.

### FRUITS OF FAITH IN THE ROMAN CHURCHES.

### A.D. 1530-1660.

However deeply we may deplore the abuses and corruptions which exist in the Roman Churches, and however certain it be that many errors injurious to Christian piety, and many offences against Christian morality, are found in that communion, still it would argue a prejudiced and uncharitable mind to close our eyes on several bright examples of Christian holiness which have adorned the Roman communion in the latter ages, and to refuse to recognise the impress of Divine grace on lives adorned by every virtue which can flow from a lively faith and charity. The contemplation of such examples will tend to remove any feelings of spiritual pride which might arise from imagining that virtue and goodness are restrained to some particular branch of the Church of Christ, while the great mass of Christendom is given over entirely to darkness and to sin.

Francis Xavier, the apostle of the Indies, was born in 1506, in Navarre, of an illustrious family, and was pursuing his studies at the University of Paris, when he became the friend, and ultimately one of the disciples of Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the order of Jesuits, a man of an enthusiastic turn of mind, and of a piety which was deeply tinged with superstition. In 1537 Xavier was ordained priest, and took the vows as a member of the new order. The following year, while Ignatius and his disciples were at Rome, whither they had gone to place themselves under the directions of the pope as to their future destination, an application was made by the King of Portugal for the assistance of some of these zealous men to preach the Gospel in the East Indies. In compli-

ance with this request, Francis Xavier was sent to Portugal, whence, in the following year, he sailed for India, with various powers and recommendations from the pope. During the voyage, he considered the crew of the vessel in which he sailed as intrusted to his peculiar care. He instructed the sailors in their catechism, preached every Sunday before the main-mast, visited the sick, converted his own cabin into an infirmary, while he himself lay on the deck; and, with the ascetic spirit of his order at that time, subsisted entirely on charity, being possessed of nothing himself. In short, during the whole voyage, he evinced a spirit of zeal and piety which afforded a pledge of the success of that great work which he was about to undertake. A.D. 1540.

In 1542 he landed at Goa; and having obtained the sanction of the bishop, he commenced his mission. The state of religion amongst professing Christians in that place was most lamentable. The Portuguese inhabitants were full of revenge, ambition, avarice, and every description of wickedness; all sentiments of religion seemed extinguished in them. The sacraments were neglected; there were scarcely any preachers; and the heathen, immersed in every sin, were neither led by precept nor example to forsake their errors and superstitions. Xavier beheld with grief the scandalous example of the nominal Christians around him; and he resolved to labour for their conversion and reformation in the first instance.

He began by instructing them in the principles of religion, and by forming the youth in the practice of piety. Having spent the morning of each day in the hospitals and prisons, assisting and comforting the distressed, he walked through the streets of Goa, with a bell in his hand, summoning all masters, for the love of God, to send their children and slaves to be catechised. The children gathered in crowds around him: he led them to church, taught them the creed and practices of devotion, and impressed on them strong sentiments

of piety and religion. The effect produced on the youth soon became manifest; the example began to spread; the whole town was influenced to turn from sin. After a time, Xavier preached in public, and visited the people in their houses; and a most extraordinary and universal reformation in their morals and habits ensued.

After six months spent in these successful labours, Xavier, hearing that many of the Paravas, a people on the eastern coast of India, near Cape Comorin, had some years before permitted themselves to be baptised, in order to gratify the Portuguese; and having gained some knowledge of their language, went thither with two young clergy who understood the language sufficiently well. Here Xavier preached the Gospel with such success, that these people were converted in thousands; and so great were the multitudes whom he baptised, that sometimes, from the fatigue of administering that sacrament, he could hardly move his arm. It is said, that he was enabled to work several remarkable cures of sick persons; and a belief in such wonders, whether well or ill-founded, seems to have had much influence in contributing to the extraordinary success of his ministry. His labours, indeed, were incredible: while he lived only on rice and water, like the very poorest of the people, he was able to devote his whole day and night, except *three* hours of sleep, to the exercise of his ministry and the duties of devotion.

Xavier had laboured for more than a year in the conversion of these people, when he was obliged to return to Goa for assistance. He came back in 1544 with several missionaries, some of whom he stationed in different towns, to continue the instruction of his converts; the others he brought with him to the adjoining kingdom of Travancore, where he baptised ten thousand Indians in one month; and in a very few months, almost the whole kingdom of Travancore embraced Christianity. He afterwards visited several other parts of India, where he founded churches. Xavier then sailed to Malacca, a famous mart for merchandise, where he

arrived in 1545; and by the irresistible ardour of his zeal, reformed the Christians in that place, and converted many pagans and Mahommedans. He next preached in the Spice Islands, Amboyna, the Moluccas, and Ceylon, in all of which he brought great numbers to the faith. In this mission he experienced many sufferings and dangers; but his zeal for God caused him rather to rejoice in those things. "The dangers to which I am exposed," said he, "and the toils I undergo for the interest of God only, are an inexhaustible spring of spiritual joys, insomuch that these islands, bare as they are of all worldly necessaries, are the very places in the world for a man to lose his sight through the excess of weeping; but they are tears of joy. I never remember to have tasted such inward delights; and these consolations of the soul are so pure, so exquisite, so constant, that they take from me all sense of my corporeal sufferings."

Having returned again to Goa, Xavier soon after sailed on a mission to Japan, where he arrived in 1549, and was received favourably by the king, who allowed him to preach the Gospel; and he applied himself with such extreme diligence to the study of the language, that in a few weeks he was able to translate the creed, and an exposition of it, together with a life of our Saviour compiled from the Gospels, and to preach in public. He made many converts, amongst whom he distributed the translations he had made. He continued to preach amongst the islands with various success: at Fuceo vast multitudes of people desired to be instructed and baptised; and the king himself was convinced of the truth of the Gospel. Having laid the foundations of the Christian Church throughout Japan, he again embarked for India in 1551; and after a short stay there, was once more on his way to preach the Gospel in China, when it pleased God to call away this great missionary, after ten years of labours and successes almost unparalleled since the days of the apostles. A.D. 1552.

CHARLES BORROMEO, archbishop of Milan, and cardinal of

A.D. 1538. the Roman Church, was born of a noble family at Arona, in the duchy of Milan. His father, a man of exemplary piety, gave him an education proportioned to the great prospects of promotion which his family connections presented; and he gave early signs of a strong attachment to literary pursuits. His uncle, Pope Pius IV., on his election to the Roman see, invited him to Rome, and created him cardinal and archbishop of Milan, when he was only twenty-two years of age. The pope intrusted to him the chief management of ecclesiastical affairs, in which he evinced an ability and discretion which would have done credit to the most experienced ecclesiastic. The Romans were remarkable for indolence and ignorance: to induce them to aspire to a more honourable character, Borromeo instituted an academy, consisting of ecclesiastics and laymen, whom his munificence and example incited to study and animated to virtue. But in the midst of a luxurious court, the young cardinal was carried away by the torrent: his palace, furniture, equipage, and table, were splendid and sumptuous; and his uncle, in order to enable him to support such expenses, heaped on him a number of high and lucrative appointments, in addition to several rich abbeys and other benefices, of which he was possessed. In 1562, Borromeo's eldest brother died; and notwithstanding his high station in the Church, he was now urged by the pope, and by all his friends, to resign his ecclesiastical dignities, and marry, in order to support his family name; but he refused their solicitations, and was ordained priest the same year.

The council of Trent re-assembled about this time, and the reformation of the clergy became the subject of much discussion. Cardinal Borromeo was not content to urge that reformation on others; he adopted it himself. He dismissed at once above eighty officers of his household; laid aside his robes of silk; and submitted once in every week to a day of voluntary fasting on bread and water. In 1566, on the death of his uncle, he retired to Milan, and engaged earnest-

ly in the reformation of his diocese. He began by the regulation of his own family, which consisted of about a hundred persons, chiefly clergy; considering that his task would be easier, when all he wished to prescribe to others was exemplified in his own house. He soon brought all his household to a most regular, orderly, and religious life. His own habits of piety and self-denial were very remarkable. He removed from his palace all the fine sculpture, paintings, hangings, and even the armorial bearings of his family; wore the coarsest vestments under his robes; and avoided, as much as possible, being served or attended on by any others. In order to inspire his clergy with a contempt for earthly possessions, he would severely reprove those who discovered an interested or covetous spirit; even bishops were not exempt from his reproofs. He himself exemplified most remarkably the virtues of charity and disinterestedness. When he came to reside at Milan, he voluntarily resigned benefices and estates to the value of 80,000 crowns per annum, reserving only an income of 20,000 crowns. The principality of Oria, which had become his property by the death of his brother, he sold for 40,000 crowns, which he commanded his almoners to distribute among the poor and the hospitals. When the list which the almoners showed him for the distribution amounted, by mistake, to 2000 crowns more, Borromeo said the mistake was too much to the advantage of the poor to be corrected, and the whole was accordingly distributed in one day. When his brother died, he also caused all the rich furniture and jewels of the family to be sold, and gave the price, which amounted to 30,000 crowns, to the poor. Several other cases of charity, on an equally large scale, might be added. His chief almoner was ordered to distribute among the poor of Milan, of whom he kept an exact list, 200 crowns every month. Borromeo would never permit any beggar to be dismissed without some alms, whatever he was.

He was exceedingly hospitable and liberal in entertaining princes, prelates, and strangers of all ranks, but always with-

out dainties or luxury; and he endeavoured as much as possible to conceal his own abstemiousness. His religious foundations, repairs of churches, of the dwellings of the clergy, and of the seminaries of learning, not only at Milan, but at Bologna, Rome, and many other places, were on the most magnificent scale of liberality.

Borromeo found his diocese in the greatest disorder. The great truths of salvation were little known or understood; and religious practices were profaned by the grossest abuses, and disfigured by superstitions. The sacraments were neglected; the clergy seem scarcely to have known how to administer them, and were slothful, ignorant, and depraved: the monasteries were full of disorders. Borromeo instituted seminaries for the instruction of the clergy; appointed a number of vicars, or rural deans, who exercised a vigilant superintendence over every part of his diocese; and held many provincial and diocesan synods, in which the most excellent and judicious regulations were made, and enforced with inflexible firmness. In the course of his proceedings, he frequently encountered the most violent opposition from those who were unwilling to be corrected. The order of monks called Humiliati were particularly irritated by his labours for their reform, and excited against him one of their members, who actually fired a musket at the archbishop, as he was one evening at prayers with his family. Borromeo calmly finished his prayer, though the ball had struck his robe (happily without wounding him,) and then, with truly Christian charity, forgave the assassin, and even solicited his pardon. But justice took its course, and the order was suppressed by the pope.

Borromeo divided the revenue of his see into three parts; one of which was appropriated to his household, another to the poor, and a third to the repairs of churches: and it was his custom to lay before the provincial councils the accounts of his revenues to the last farthing, saying that he was no more than an administrator or steward. He employed

no clergy of his own kindred in the government of his diocese; nor did he resign to them any of the benefices which had been conferred on him.

It was one of his greatest pleasures to converse with, and catechise, the poor; and he would often visit them in the wildest and most mountainous parts of his diocese. On one occasion, while he was engaged in his visitation, the bishop of Ferrara coming to meet him, found him lying under a fit of the ague on a coarse bed, and in a very poor cottage. Borromeo, observing his surprise, remarked "that he was treated very well, and much better than he deserved." During the dreadful ravages of a pestilence, this excellent man encouraged his clergy to administer the consolations of religion to the sick and dying, and he was himself assiduous in the performance of this dangerous duty. On this occasion he sold all his furniture to procure medicine and nourishment for the unhappy sufferers. He was careful not to lose a moment of his time: even at table he listened to some pious book, or dictated letters or instructions. When he fasted on bread and water, and dined in private, he read at the same time, and on his knees when the Bible was before him. After dinner, instead of conversing, he gave audience to his rural deans and clergy. He allowed himself no time for recreation; finding in the different employments of his office both corporal exercise and relaxation of mind sufficient for maintaining the vigour of his mind and health of his body.

When he was put in mind of any fault, he expressed the most sincere gratitude; and he gave a commission to two prudent and religious clergy of his household to remind him of any thing they saw amiss in his actions; and he frequently requested the same favour of strangers. He was remarkable for sincerity: it appeared in all his words and actions; and his promises were inviolable. He delighted in prayer, to which he gave a large part of his time; and he never said any prayer, or performed any religious office, with precipitation, whatever business of importance might be on his hands,

or however he might be pressed for time. In giving audience, and in the greatest hurry of business, his countenance, his modesty, and all his words, showed that he was full of the recollection of God. His spirit of prayer, and the love of God which filled his heart, gave to him remarkably the power of exciting and encouraging others to religion. A short address, even a single word or action, sometimes produced the most powerful effects in animating his clergy to repentance and to virtue.

This great and good man died in 1584, in the forty-seventh year of his age; with the same piety and sanctity which adorned his short but admirable life.

Francis de Sales was born of noble parents in Savoy, and was remarkable for a spirit of piety and meekness from his earliest years. His mother taught him to venerate the Church and religion: she read to him the lives of holy men; brought him with her to visit the poor, and made him distribute her alms to them. Having studied theology and law at the Universities of Paris and Padua, his parents intended that he should follow the legal profession, and they had already obtained a lucrative and important office from the Duke of Savoy for him; but Francis had resolved to devote himself to the sacred ministry, and declined so advantageous an establishment. Through the intervention and entreaties of a relative, his parents were at length, with much difficulty, persuaded to accede to his wishes, and he then was appointed to a dignity in the Church, and was ordained deacon. His diocesan, the bishop of Annecy, immediately employed him in preaching, in which he was eminently successful, as his sermons were always the result of fervent prayer. He was observed to decline whatever might gain the applause of the world; and he preferred resorting to the habitations of the poor, and to the rural districts, rather than preaching before the great and opulent. In 1591, the first year of his ministry, he instituted a society at Annecy, the associates of which were obliged to instruct the ignorant, to comfort

and exhort the sick and prisoners, and to abstain from all lawsuits.

In 1594 the Duke of Savoy having conquered Geneva, and some of the adjoining parts of Switzerland, Francis de Sales was commissioned to preach in those parts to the reformed. Impressed, like the rest of his communion, with the mistaken notion that the Roman Pontiff is, by Divine appointment, the centre of catholic unity, he of course viewed the reformed as separated from the true Church, and he laboured for their conversion for several years. He was much respected by Beza, and the rest of the reformed in Switzerland; and the excellence of his own character, and the piety and meekness which he always evinced, probably did much more for his cause than any other arguments by which it was sustained. The plague at one time raged violently in the place where he resided, but this did not deter him from assisting the sick in their last moments by day and night; and he was wonderfully preserved in the pestilence, which carried off several of the clergy who aided him. In 1599 he became coadjutor of the bishop of Annecy, with the right of succession to that see; and soon after was obliged to go to France, where he was received by all ranks and classes with the utmost distinction. He preached before the king, who endeavoured to detain him in France by promises of a large pension, and of the first vacant bishopric: but Francis de Sales declined all these offers; and returning to the poor bishopric of Annecy, was soon after, on the death of his predecessor, consecrated its pastor in 1602. He now laid down a plan of life, to which he ever after rigorously adhered. He resolved to wear no expensive clothing; to have no paintings except of a devotional character in his house; to possess no splendid furniture; to use no coach or carriage, but make his visitations on foot. His family was to consist of two priests, one to act as his chaplain, the other to superintend his servants and temporalities; his table to be plain and frugal. He resolved to be present at all religious and devotional meet-

ings and festivals in the churches; to distribute abundant alms; to visit the sick and poor in person; to rise every day at four, meditate for an hour, read private service, then prayers with his family; then to read the Scripture; celebrate the holy eucharist; and afterwards apply to business till dinner. He then gave an hour to conversation, and spent the remainder of the afternoon in business and prayer. After supper he read a pious book to his family for an hour; then prayed with them, and retired to his private devotions, and to rest. Such was the general mode of life of this excellent man.

Immediately after he became bishop, he applied himself to preaching, and to all the other duties of his station. He was very cautious in conferring holy orders, ordaining but few clergy, and only after a most rigid examination of their qualifications. He was also exceedingly diligent in promoting the instruction of the ignorant by catechising on Sundays and holydays; and his personal labours in this respect had a very great influence in persuading the clergy of his diocese to follow so good an example. He still continued to delight in preaching in small villages, and to the poorest people, whom he regarded as the special objects of his care. He had a very wide correspondence on religious subjects; and composed several books full of piety and devotion, but of course not altogether free from the superstitions of his age and communion. His compassion was so excited by the unhappy condition of a poor deaf and dumb man, that he received him into his own family, taught him by signs, and instructed him in religion. He founded a new order of nuns, in which few bodily austerities were practised, and no great burdens of religious observances were imposed; his object being to render it suitable even for the sickly and weak.

The same disinterested spirit which he had early manifested always continued. When he was solicited by Henry IV., king of France, to accept an abbey of large income, he refused it, saying, "that he dreaded riches as much as others desired them; and that the less he had of them, the less he

should have to answer for." The same prince offered to name him to the dignity of cardinal at the next promotion; but he replied, that though he did not despise the proffered dignity, he was persuaded that great titles did not suit him, and might raise new obstacles to his salvation. His conscientious firmness was also remarkable. On one occasion the parliament of Chambery in Savoy seized his temporalities for refusing, at its desire, to publish an ecclesiastical censure which he thought uncalled for by the circumstances of the case. When he heard of the seizure of his possessions, he said that he thanked God for teaching him by it, "that a bishop is altogether spiritual." He did not desist from preaching, or apply to the sovereign for redress; but behaved in so kind and friendly a manner to those who had insulted him most grossly, that at length the parliament became ashamed of its proceedings, and restored his temporalities.

In 1619 he accompanied the Cardinal of Savoy to Paris, to demand the sister of King Louis XIII. in marriage for the prince of Piedmont. While he was in that city he preached a course of Lent sermons, which, aided by his conferences, the example of his holy life, and the sweetness of his discourse, most powerfully moved, not only the devout, but even libertines and atheists. He was entreated, for the sake of his health, not to preach twice in the day. He replied, with a smile, "that it cost him much less to preach a sermon than to find an excuse for himself when invited to perform that office. God had appointed him to be a pastor and a preacher, and ought not every one to follow his profession?" Amongst his common sayings was this, "That truth must be always charitable, for bitter zeal does harm rather than good. Reprehensions are a food of hard digestion, and ought to be dressed on a fire of burning charity so well, that all harshness be taken away; otherwise, like unripe fruit, they will only produce pains. Charity seeks not itself nor its own interests, but purely the honour and interest of God. Pride, vanity, and passion, cause bitterness and harshness. A re-

medy injudiciously applied may be a poison. A judicious silence is always better than a truth spoken without charity." On one occasion, seeing a vicious and scandalous priest thrown into prison, he fell at his feet, and, with tears, conjured him to have compassion on him his pastor, on religion which he scandalized, and on his own soul. The man was so deeply impressed by this conduct, that he was entirely converted, and became a virtuous man from that moment.

In 1622 this holy bishop fell into an apoplexy; and as his illness slowly increased, he poured forth his soul in supplication to God, and in all those expressions of devotion and humility which might have been anticipated at the close of so Christian a life. He then peacefully expired, in the fifty-sixth year of his age.

Vincent de Paul was born near the Pyrenees in France, of poor parentage, in 1576; and even from his childhood showed a seriousness and a love of prayer remarkable for his years. His father was determined, by the strong inclinations of his child for piety and study, and by the quickness of his parts, to give him a school-education; and for this purpose placed him at a monastery of Franciscan friars. He afterwards studied at the University of Toulouse, where he was admitted to the order of priesthood in 1600. Vincent was already endowed with many virtues; but he was now to experience trials which were calculated to make the deepest demands on his self-denial, his humility, and his submission to the will of God. He was on a voyage from Narbonne to Marseilles, on some affairs, in 1605, when the vessel in which he was sailing was captured by pirates from Africa, who wounded him with an arrow, laid him in chains, and sailed for the coast of Barbary. At Tunis, Vincent was sold as a slave to a physician, who was a humane man, but who used his utmost efforts to induce his slave to embrace the Mahommedan law, promising, on that condition, to leave him all his riches, and communicate to him the secrets of his science. The result need scarcely be told. Vincent remained firm in

his faith; and on his master's death was sold to another Mahommedan, who treated him with extreme harshness and cruelty. He, however, learned to bear all his afflictions with comfort and joy, by remembering his blessed Redeemer, and studying to imitate his perfect meekness, patience, silence, and charity. At last he was sold again to a renegade (one who had apostatised from Christianity.) This man had several Turkish wives, one of whom frequently went to the field where Vincent was digging, and, out of curiosity, would ask him to sing the praises of God. He used to sing to her, with tears in his eyes, the Psalm, "By the waters of Babylon we sat down and wept," and several Christian hymns. She gradually became so much captivated with the excellence of the Christian religion, though still unconverted and professing the Mahommedan creed, that she continually reproached her husband for his apostacy from so excellent a religion; and at length his conscience was so awakened, that he repented of his sin, and resolved to return to his country and his faith. In 1607 he made his escape to France, accompanied by Vincent de Paul. They afterwards went to Rome, where the renegade was received again into the Church.

On Vincent's return to Paris, he served as curate at a neighbouring village, and afterwards became preceptor and spiritual director in a noble family; and here his remarkable success in awakening the sleeping conscience of a dying sinner to a full sense of his guilt, led to his employment in the mission of preaching repentance; for which purpose he became the founder of a congregation or society of clergy, who were bound to devote themselves to the conversion of sinners, and the training up of clergy for the holy ministry. They traversed every part of France, and engaged in the sacred office wherever their assistance, in aid of the ordinary ministry, was particularly called for. Vincent lived to see this institution become very extensive, and highly approved by the Church and State.

He was also the founder of many other religious and char-

itable societies, especially of the Society of Charity, for attending on all the poor sick persons in each parish; and of other societies for visiting the sick in hospitals, and for the education of girls. He also procured the foundation of many great hospitals. He instituted spiritual exercises for those who were about to receive holy orders, and ecclesiastical conferences on the duties of the clerical office. During the wars in Lorraine, hearing of the misery to which the people of that province were reduced, he collected alms amongst pious and charitable people at Paris to the amount of 100,000*l*. He was in the highest favour with King Louis XIII. and Queen Anne of Austria, who consulted him on all ecclesiastical affairs, and on the collation of benefices.

Amidst such a multiplicity of important affairs, his soul was always set on God. He was remarkable for self-denial, for profound humility, and for a spirit of prayer. He laid it down as a rule of humility, that, if possible, a man ought never to talk of his own concerns; such discourse usually proceeding from, and nourishing in the heart, the spirit of pride. At length, at the advanced age of eighty-four, this pious and profitable servant of God was called to his everlasting reward, amidst the veneration and love of all men. He died in 1660, and was buried in the church of St. Lazarus at Paris.

---

## CHAPTER XXVI.

### ON THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES.

### A.D. 1517-1839.

The faith and discipline of the eastern or Greek Churches in Russia, Turkey, Greece, Asia, Syria, and Egypt, have remained with scarcely any variation during the whole of this period. In the sixteenth century, the Lutherans sought a

union with the Constantinopolitan Church, but were prevented by various differences from accomplishing their wish. In the seventeenth century some intercourse took place between the Constantinopolitan and English Churches. Cyril Lucaris, patriarch of Constantinople, dedicated his work on the faith of the Eastern Church to King Charles I., and presented to him the celebrated Alexandrian manuscript of the Bible. And in 1653 Dr. Basire, archdeacon of Northumberland, when travelling in Greece, was invited twice by the metropolitan of Achaia to preach before the bishops and clergy; and he received from Païsius, patriarch of Jerusalem, his patriarchal seal, to express his desire of communion with the Church of England. The communion of our Churches and those of the East has not, however, yet been restored. In the seventeenth century, also, the doctrine of transubstantiation was first embraced by a portion of the Greek Church, though many persons still only make use of the term, without believing the Roman doctrine on the subject.

In the latter part of the sixteenth century the Russian Church, which had previously always been subject to the see of Constantinople, became independent; for, at the desire of the Russians, a patriarch of Moscow was created by the eastern patriarchs. A.D. 1589. Peter the Great, in the last century, suppressed this office, and appointed a synod to conduct the affairs of the Russian Church. A.D. 1700. He also reformed several abuses and corruptions in that Church; but these improvements were not relished by some of the clergy and people, who were attached to the old superstitions and abuses, and who, like the Romanists in England and Ireland, separated from the Church, and are termed Roskolniks, A.D. 1666. or schismatics. Within the last few years the Church in the newly created kingdom of Greece has also been withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the see of Constantinople, and placed under the direction of a synod of bishops: but this has not led to any division in the eastern Church; for, unlike the

popes, the patriarchs of Constantinople do not treat as heretics or schismatics every one who is not subject to their jurisdiction. The Greek Church has also recently gained a considerable addition, by the reunion of those Churches in Poland who held the Greek rites, and which had been for some time obedient to the pope.

## CHAPTER XXVII.

### ON THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF INFIDELITY.

I HAVE already alluded to the spread of infidelity in the last century; but a circumstance so deeply affecting the Christian Church deserves a more detailed notice. It is fearful to contemplate the excess of wickedness to which God sometimes permits his enemies to proceed. One can hardly imagine that any human being in his senses, who was born in a Christian land, and who had been baptised and educated in a Christian Church, could be so far transported by his passions as to declare himself the enemy of Jesus Christ! The heart trembles at the very notion of such blasphemy. But that a man should, for nearly seventy years, devote himself to the extirpation of Christianity; to the destruction of that faith which alone consoles man amidst his afflictions and his fears; to the extinction of every principle of virtue and morality, and the inculcation of general depravity,—this opens to our view a deeper gulf of human guilt than even the records of Scripture supply, or the imagination could have conceived. Such was VOLTAIRE; a man whose private life was defiled by the grossest immorality, and whose heart burned with such a demoniacal hatred of HIM who came down from heaven and voluntarily sacrificed himself on the cross for the salvation of sinners, that he adopted as his watchword on all occasions those awful words, "Ecrasez l'infame!"—CRUSH THE

WRETCH! that is, "Crush Christ; crush the Christian religion!" Such was the language and the feeling of that organized band of infidels, who in the earlier part of last century associated in the impious attempt to subvert Christianity.

England had been already disgraced by the writings of some unbelievers; but the works of Herbert and Bolingbroke, of Collins and Tindal, had produced little effect on the good sense and religious principles of the English nation. The clergy effectually exposed their errors, and they became the objects of popular hatred; but they were unhappily destined to find a more congenial soil in France.

Voltaire was born in Paris in 1694, and lived to the age of eighty-four, dying in the year 1778. He was endowed with great natural abilities, quickness, versatility, wit; with a remarkable power of sarcasm; and a pointed, easy, and fluent style, which was unrestrained by any principles of truth or decency. While he was at college, he manifested so sceptical a spirit, that his preceptor one day said to him, "Unfortunate young man, at some future time you will become the standard bearer of infidelity." After he had left college, he associated only with persons of infamous morals; and having published some infidel opinions, which gave offence to the ruling powers of France, he retired to England, where he became acquainted with several unbelievers like himself. Here he formed his resolution to destroy Christianity; and on his return to Paris, in 1730, he made no secret of his design and his hopes. "I am weary," he would say, "of hearing people repeat that twelve men were sufficient to establish Christianity. I will prove that *one* may suffice to overthrow it."

In order to accomplish his design, Voltaire found it necessary to obtain the assistance of several coadjutors: of these D'Alembert was the chief. He was remarkable for his crafty cunning, which enabled him to insinuate infidelity in the most plausible and least offensive manner. His expressions were generally moderate; while Voltaire used to express his wish

that he might "die on a heap of Christians immolated at his feet." Another associate was Frederick II., king of Prussia, a great general and statesman, but a shallow philosopher. He was in continual correspondence with Voltaire; complimented him on being the "scourge of religion;" and plotted for its destruction. Diderot was another coadjutor of Voltaire, who with D'Alembert devoted themselves even till death to the pursuit of their unhallowed design.

I have already spoken of the watchword of this association, the object of which was the overthrow of every altar where Christ was worshipped. It was not merely the Gallican or Roman doctrine which was marked out for destruction. In the latter part of his career, Voltaire exulted at the dissemination of Hume's infidel principles in England, and at the prospect of the fall of the Church of England, exclaiming with delight, that "in London Christ was *spurned*." On another occasion, he rejoiced that "in Geneva, Calvin's own town," but few believers remained.

Voltaire invited men to forsake their religion by promising them liberty of thought. He declared, that "nothing was so contemptible and miserable in his eyes, as to see one man have recourse to another in matters of faith, or to ask what he ought to believe." Reason, liberty, and philosophy, were continually in the mouths of Voltaire and D'Alembert. Their adherents represented them as "devoutly waiting for those days when the sun should shine only on *free* men, acknowledging *no other master but their own reason*." Voltaire had but little of the spirit of martyrdom: his continual exhortation to the conspirators was, to "strike, but *conceal* their hands;" that is, to write anonymously. "The monster" (Christianity,) he said, "must fall, pierced by a hundred invisible hands; yes, let it fall beneath a thousand repeated blows." In accordance with this advice, the press swarmed with anonymous publications of the most impious character. The principal mode of propagating infidelity was the publication of the celebrated Encyclopedia, of which D'Alembert

was the editor, and which was to contain so perfect an assemblage of all the arts and sciences, as to render all other books superfluous. The utmost caution was used in insinuating infidel principles, lest the design should be detected, and crushed by the hand of power. All the principal articles on religion were written in such a manner as to avoid offence; while by means of references at the conclusion of each, the reader was directed to places where open infidelity was taught. Irreligion and atheism were inculcated even in articles on chemistry, or other sciences, where their existence could not be suspected.

When this work was completed, it obtained an immense circulation. Numberless editions were printed, in each of which, under pretence of correction, more impiety was introduced. In one of these, a respectable and learned divine, M. Bergier, was persuaded into writing the part which treated of religion, lest it should fall into the hands of unbelievers; but it was easy to foresee what actually happened: his name conferred respectability on the book, while all its other articles teemed with the most dreadful impiety and blasphemy.

Infidelity now rapidly spread through France, and through every part of the continent of Europe; several of the crowned heads were more or less favourable. The Empress of Russia, the Kings of Prussia, Denmark, Poland, Sweden, and all the princes of Germany, were either admirers of Voltaire or avowed infidels. The abominable licentiousness of the court of France assisted the conspiracy: the French ministry, tainted with infidelity, refused to put the laws in force for the suppression of blasphemous, infidel, and immoral publications, which now issued in a flood from the press. The most eminent scientific men, and the most popular writers of France, such as Buffon, Lalande, Marmontel, Rousseau, were unbelievers. It is awful to contemplate the excess of wickedness at which these men had arrived. The history of this time relates, that "above all the adepts did a fiend named Con-

dorcet hate the Son of God. At the very name of the Deity the monster raged! And it appeared as if he wished to revenge on Heaven the heart it had given him." Infidelity had widely spread among the higher orders; it was now to be disseminated amongst the lowest. Infidel and blasphemous tracts were printed in myriads, and circulated profusely in all parts. Diderot and D'Alembert disputed on Christianity in the coffee-rooms of Paris; and the pretended advocate of Christianity took care always to be defeated.

It is lamentable to add, that the clergy of the Roman communion were not universally to be found on the side of Christianity. The ecclesiastical patronage of the state, indeed, was too often exercised for the subversion of religion. The Abbé Barruel observes, with reference to France, that "the enemies of the Church possessed themselves of its avenues, to prevent the preferment of those whose virtues or learning they dreaded. When the bishops wished to repel an unworthy member, Choiseul, the infidel minister, replied, 'such are the men we want and will have.'" Cardinal de Brienne, archbishop of Toulouse, was a friend of D'Alembert, and became an open apostate from religion. He was followed by the bishops of Autun, Viviers, Orleans, Lydda, Babylon, &c. In the infidel association of the "Illuminati" were many priests, and even a high dignitary of the German Church. The names of the Abbés Raynal, De Prades, Condillac, De Leire, Morrelet, Terray, Marsy, &c., are unhappily but too well known as connected with infidelity. Numbers of Jacobin and infidel priests were also found in Italy, Spain, and other parts of the Continent. The majority, however, of the Roman clergy throughout Europe retained their faith, and, under the most grievous afflictions and persecutions for the name of Christ, evinced an increased measure of zeal and piety.

Voltaire was received with a sort of popular triumph at Paris in 1778; but very shortly after, this enemy of God and man expired in the most dreadful torments of agony and re-

morse. His associates did not long survive him; but the seed which they had sown was now to produce its bitter fruit.

All religious and all moral principle being now extinguished, and every passion of man's nature being left without control, human society perished amidst the horrors of the FRENCH REVOLUTION of 1789. Amidst rebellion, anarchy, plunder, desolation, famine, massacre, and every imaginable evil, the reign of infidelity commenced. The worship and ministry of Christianity were proscribed, and God was no longer acknowledged. Then was beheld the woful spectacle of bishops and priests hastening to the infidel assembly of France, casting from them the ensigns of their ministry, and proclaiming themselves no longer believers in God. The Roman Church, scourged for her sins, and especially for that spirit of pride which resists all efforts for the removal of superstitions, beheld her pope despoiled of his territories, and the captive of Buonaparte; her revenues plundered in France and Italy; her monasteries suppressed; her bishops driven from their sees into exile, or dying beneath the guillotine; her clergy perishing by the hand of the executioner, or by more wholesale massacre. She beheld faith vanishing away, and a generation of men arising WITHOUT RELIGION.

Although the return of peace and order has been favourable to the restoration of Christianity, and though additional fervour may have been added to faith so sorely tried and afflicted, yet it is certain that the effects of the infidel conspiracy of last century have been deep and lasting. It is true, indeed, that Christianity has for many years past been less directly assailed; that infidelity may have been less industriously propagated; but still an infidel and perverse generation lives without God in the world; and in France, more especially, the prevalence of this deadly evil is so great, that an eloquent ecclesiastic of that nation (La Mennais) some years since declared, that "the state to which we are approaching is one of the signs by which will be recognised that last war announced by Jesus Christ: 'nevertheless, when the Son of

man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?'" "What," said he, "do you perceive every where but a profound indifference as to duties and creeds, with an unbridled love of pleasure and of gold, by means of which any thing can be obtained? All is bought, for all is sold; conscience, honour, religion, opinions, dignities, power, consideration, even respect: a vast shipwreck of all truths and all virtues." Indifference, total indifference to religion; the uttermost neglect and contempt of Christianity, as a thing unworthy of examination, are the characteristics of modern infidelity in France.

In Germany the spirit of unbelief assumes the name of Rationalism, and pretends to respect the character of Christ; while, under the guise of Christianity, it boldly subjects the revelation of God to the judgment and criticisms of man's reason, rejects all that is incomprehensible by our limited faculties, deprives the Gospel of all its peculiar and divinely revealed doctrines, tramples in contempt on the universal belief of all Christians from the beginning, arraigns the Scriptures themselves falsehood and folly; and leaves the mind at last without one particle of Christian faith or hope. This destructive system arose among the Protestants of Germany after the middle of the last century. It has unhappily become almost universally prevalent amongst them.

Though England has, through the infinite mercy of God, been comparatively unvisited by the scourges which have so terribly afflicted the nations of the Continent, and though open infidelity has been always met, confronted, and subdued by the energy of religious zeal, it cannot but inspire alarm to behold the wide dissemination of principles which tend, by a very short descent, to the overthrow of all faith. Such appears to be the character of that most erroneous notion, that sincerity is the only test of religion; so that he who persuades himself that he is right in his faith, believes all that is necessary for his salvation: for if this be true, it cannot be necessary to believe any particular doctrine of Christianity;

it cannot be necessary to prefer Christ to Mahomet; and belief in Christ cannot be (as the Gospel says it is) the condition on which men shall be saved. How true is it that the Evil one clothes himself as an angel of light! In the last century infidelity appeared under the specious garb of philosophy and freedom of thought: it is now insinuating itself under the disguise of charity, kindness, and liberality. All modes of faith are treated with impartial favour, all are regarded as equally true; and the hour may be at hand, when the necessary conclusion will be drawn, that they are all equally false. There is much in the spirit of the age to threaten such lamentable results;—a spirit of insatiable inquiry, not always accompanied by modesty or patience; a thirst for novelty; a superficial information; the adoration of intellect and of knowledge; and the exclusive devotion of men to sciences which relate to merely material objects. All combine to show the dangers to which belief is exposed; and to warn the Church of God that renewed watchfulness, and humility, and zeal, are more than ever imperatively called for.

---

## CHAPTER XXVIII.

### CONCLUSION.

We have now briefly traced the progress of the Church of Christ through eighteen centuries of its varied existence. In the midst of temptations and dangers, the ark of eternal truth has still been preserved by an Almighty hand. That "city set on an hill," that "ensign" which was once "set up to the Gentiles," has never been concealed. The Church has always continued to preach "Christ crucified" as the Saviour of the world, and to urge the necessity of believing and obeying his words; and amidst the existing diversities of religious doctrine it will be found, that all those churches which

have not arisen from schism or voluntary separation from the universal Church, agree to a very great extent in their belief. In proof of this, it may be observed, that the three creeds, called the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian, are accepted and approved equally by the Greek or Oriental, the British, and the Roman Churches, as well as by the relics of the foreign reformation. The same doctrines which were universally received in the second century are still so in the nineteenth. All Churches believe, and with one mouth confess, one God, who created the world by his only-begotten Son, Our Lord Jesus Christ, who being co-eternal with the Father, and of equal glory, and power, and majesty, came down from heaven and became man for our salvation, and in his human nature suffered death on the cross, and ascended into heaven, making an eternal and all-sufficient atonement and intercession for us. All believe that the condition of man by nature is such, that he is unable without the aid of Divine grace to turn to God and become pleasing and acceptable to him; that to sinful man Divine grace is given by the free and unmerited mercy of God; and that he is enabled by the sanctifying influences of the eternal Spirit of God, the third person in the most blessed Trinity, to triumph over the sins and infirmities of his nature, and to become sanctified by faith and the love of God, bringing forth the fruits of obedience. All believe that we shall give an account of our works at the last judgment, when the righteous shall be rewarded with life eternal, and the wicked consigned to everlasting fire. The holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are universally acknowledged to be the word of God, given by inspiration of the Holy Ghost. The sacraments instituted by Christ are celebrated amongst all nations; and the same Christian ministry has descended by successive ordinations of bishops from the time of the apostles to the present day. Such is the substantial and real agreement in doctrine which exists between Churches which are in some respects dissentient from each other. Their differences

turn chiefly on doctrines and practices not taught by our Lord, but which some men in later ages have imagined to be deducible from revelation, or to be allowable and justifiable. Questions as to the truth and lawfulness of such doctrines and practices divide the Christian Churches; but it will probably be found that no article of the faith, no doctrine clearly and distinctly revealed by our Lord, is denied by any of these Churches.

It may be added, that many even of the sectaries or schismatics, who have voluntarily forsaken the Church, still maintain the great mass of Christian doctrine, however destitute they may be of Christian charity.

The union of the Christian Church, flowing from a common faith, and hope, and charity, was indeed enjoined and urged by our blessed Lord and Saviour; but no promise was given that the Church should at all times be united in external communion. The divisions which have for a long time existed, arose chiefly, if not entirely, from the mistaken notions of the papal authority entertained by the popes and their adherents during the eleventh and following centuries. If it should please God to open the eyes of Romanists to their error on this point, we might have some reason to hope for the approach of those happy days predicted in holy Scripture, when "Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim." On the doctrine of the papal supremacy the whole mass of superstitions which we deplore to see in the Roman communion essentially depends. It is this doctrine which leads Romanists to view the Oriental and British Churches separated from the true Church; and which renders it equally impossible for those Churches to hope for the restoration of general harmony and union.

And while we lament the disunion of the Christian Church, we have also to deplore the multitude of abuses and errors which in many parts of the world choke the good seed and make it unfruitful. Superstitions which arose "while men slept," still continue, almost unchecked and unresisted, to

prevail. The ignorant are in many Churches left exposed to the danger of honouring the creature instead of the Creator, by the worship of images, and the invocation of saints. On all sides there is much of infirmity, of imperfection, and of sin. Every Church and every age has its temptations and its faults. At one period there may be a tendency to superstition; at another, a tendency to self-confidence, spiritual pride, or irreverence. Those who are ready to reject all usurped authority in religion, may not be altogether free from a spirit of pride, and a disposition to resist even legitimate rule. A fear of bigotry and enthusiasm may sometimes be found united with slothfulness and indifference. To every Church and every individual, the apostolic precept, "Be not high minded, but fear," should be the subject of continual meditation and prayer. It is only in this spirit that we should ever dwell on the faults of others, or on the blessings which the mercy of God has vouchsafed to bestow on ourselves.

But, amidst our sorrows for the numerous evils with which the sin and infirmity of human nature have afflicted the Church, we are consoled by the perpetuity of the Church itself, and by the many examples of Christian sanctity which have in every age adorned our holy faith. Nothing can more powerfully prove to us the presence of God with his Church, than the lives of those men whom Divine grace has transformed into the image of Christ. There is in true religion a REALITY which comes home to the heart of every one; which stimulates the feeblest faith, and animates the most languid charity.

THE END.

# QUESTIONS ON PALMER'S COMPENDIOUS ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

## CHAPTER I.—INTRODUCTION.

PAGE. QUESTION.

1 1. WHAT impressive lesson is derived from the history of the *world?*
2. What counteracting tendency is visible in the history of the *Church?*
3. How has true religion essentially been always the same?
2 4. With what inclinations has it had to contend?
5. What is the life of a true Christian?
3 6. How is the Church of Christ described in Scripture?
7. What external trials was it to endure?
8. What dangers from heretical teachers?
4 9. What has saved the Church from destruction?
10. What promises have been given by the Saviour?
11. In what respects does the History of the Church differ from other histories, and what proofs of the truth of christianity are thereby afforded?
12. Into how many periods may it be divided?
5 13. Give the limits and character of the 1st period?
14. " " 2nd "
15. " " 3rd "
16. " " 4th "
17. " " 5th "

## CHAPTER II.—EARLY PROGRESS OF CHRISTIANITY.—A. D. 30—320.

6 1. To what is the Church compared in Scripture?
2. How has the event corresponded with the predictions?
3. What commission did Christ give, and when?
4. How many disciples were assembled after our Lord's ascension?
5. How was their number increased, and when?
6. To what city was it as yet confined?
7 7. What good effect had the persecution at Jerusalem? give the date?
8. Whither was christianity extended?
9. What effect had the preaching of St. Paul upon the Gentiles? describe his journeys: What is the date of his martyrdom?
8 10. Where did the other apostles labour?
11. To whom does St. Peter address his 1st Epistle? Whence does he date it?
12. What Church did St. Mark found?
13. What other countries are said to have been visited?
14. What is the testimony of Tacitus, and the date?
9 15. What is the language and the date of the letter of Pliny?
16. Give the testimony of Justin Martyr: of Irenæus: of Tertullian: and their respective dates?
10 17. What nations were converted during the next century?
18. Who was the first Christian Emperor?

## CHAPTER III.—OF THE FAITH OF THE CHURCH.

10 1. What did the promises of Christ to his disciples imply?
2. What conclusion may we hence derive?
11 3. What weight is due to the confession of Irenæus?
4. What are the doctrines he sets forth?
5. How does he say they were received by the Church of his day?

PAGE. QUESTION.

11 6. Show their agreement with the Apostles' and Nicene creed?
12 7. What says Pliny as to the worship of Christ?
8. What does the condemnation of heretics illustrate?
9. How were Theodotus and Artemon treated at Rome? the date?
10. How was Paul of Samosata treated at Antioch? the date?
11. What does the Epistle of the Synod state?
12. What was the error of Praxeas, Noetus, and Sabellius; and how was it received by the Church? the date?
13 13. What were the heresies of the Gnostics, and Manichæans?

## CHAPTER IV.—FRUITS OF FAITH: MARTYRS.

1. How has the power of true faith been especially exhibited?
2. What hope encouraged them?
3. What afflictions did they endure?
14 4. Who were their earliest enemies?
5. Who was the first great persecutor? the date?
6. What is the description given by Tacitus?
7. What punishments were inflicted?
15 8. How did the heathen regard the steadfastness of the sufferers?
9. What Apostles perished in this persecution?
10. Under what emperor was the next persecution? the date?
11. What befell the Apostle St. John?
12. What other persecutions took place?
13. Which of these was the most severe?
16 14. What is the date of the martyrdom of Polycarp?
15. What account have we of it?
16. Did he flee from persecution?
17. How did he behave when arrested?
18 18. What was the character of his prayer?
19. What was he persuaded to offer: and how was he treated on refusing?
20. How was he received in the amphitheatre?
21. What did the proconsul tell him to do?
22. What was his reply?
18 23. How long had he been a Christian?
24. What did he say of future punishment?
25. How was his confession received by the multitude?
19 26. To what death was he sentenced?
27. Who especially aided in his execution?
28. For what did he give thanks to God, when at the stake?
29. What confession did he make in this prayer?
20 30. What appearance is said to have been exhibited at his death; and how may it be accounted for?
31. What did his enemies endeavour to prevent?
32. What does the epistle teach as to the worship of Christ?
33. Name some other martyrs for the truth?

## CHAPTER V.—FRUITS OF FAITH: LIVES OF CHRISTIANS.

21 1. Was the profession of faith easy at this time?
2. What was the effect on the true followers of Christ?
3. What has been the result of the cessation of persecution?
4. What has increased in later ages?
5. What was evidenced in the lives of the early Christians?
22 6. Give the testimony of Justin Martyr?
7. How did Christians show their charity?

PAGE. QUESTION.

22 8. How often was the Holy Eucharist administered?
9. What does Tertullian say of christian marriages?
10. Between whom only ought they to be contracted?
11. What is said of St. Ignatius? his date?
23 12. Of Justin Martyr? of Polycarp? the dates?
13. Of Irenæus? his date?
14. Of Tertullian? Clement of Alexandria? Origen? Cyprian? Dionysius?
15. How long are miracles said to have continued?

## CHAPTER VI.—COMMUNION, RITES AND DISCIPLINE.

24 1. What precept is especially inculcated in Scripture?
2. What duty hence arises as to Church Communion?
3. How did the Apostles regard schism?
4. When did Church Communion exist in greatest perfection?
5. How was it manifested in the days of the Apostles?
6. Did it continue after their decease?
25 7. What were letters commendatory?
8. Why was the Epistle of St. Clement of Rome written?
9. What other epistles are mentioned?
10. What does Dionysius say of the Church of Rome in the 2nd century?
11. What is the testimony of Dionysius of Alexandria in the next century?
12. What instances of contention are there even in the times of the Apostles?
13. State the particulars of the contest concerning Easter; and when it happened?
26 14. State the difference between Stephen of Rome and the African Churches?
15. What was the result of this difference?
16. What was the difference between these dissensions and formal schisms?
17. What was the effect of each?
18. What was the Novatian schism and when did it happen?
19. What was the Donatist schism? when? how long did it last?
27 20. How were these separations regarded in the early church?
21. Of what does Justin Martyr give a full account?
22. What qualifications does he mention for baptism?
23. What does he call baptism and those baptized?
24. What does he say of the mode of baptism?
25. How were all converts made *members* of the Christian Church?
26. What was done when infants were baptized?
27. How early at least was the practice of infant baptism?
28. What was the question in Cyprian's time?
28 29. Were infants admitted to circumcision?
30. What did our Lord do to little children?
31. What is said of *households* in the New Testament?
32. What conclusion did the church draw therefrom?
33. What rite followed baptism?
34. What did the apostles do to those baptized?
35. What does Tertullian say of it?
36. Why was confirmation generally administered *soon* after baptism?
37. What does Justin say of assemblies for public worship?
29 38. What is said of the consecration of the bread and wine?
39. What was done with it when consecrated?
40. What name was given it, and who only were permitted to receive it?
41. How did the Christians receive and regard it?
42. What does he say of the institution of this sacrament?

PAGE. QUESTION.

30 43. Whom did they bless in their offerings?
44. How did they observe Sunday?
45. What collections did they make, and for what purpose?
46. Why did they assemble on Sunday?
47. What confession of faith was made previous to baptism?
48. What did Philip require of the Eunuch?
49. How ancient are creeds? the Apostles'? the Nicene?
31 50. How many *liturgies* were there in the 4th century?
51. Where were they severally employed?
52. What power had each church?
53. Which liturgy does the English and American most resemble?
54. What was the nature of penitence for secret sins?
55. What penitence did the Church require for public ones?
32 56. What was the discipline observed?
57. What was done when the time was finished?
58. What was the office of the penitentiary? when instituted?
59. Why was it discontinued and when?
33 60. Of what orders did the ministry instituted by the Apostles consist?
61. What does Irenæus say on the subject?
62. Where was Timothy placed? where Titus?
63. For how long was episcopal government only recognized?
64. Which were the chief sees?
65. How were all bishoprics regarded as to spiritual authority?
66. How were the clergy appointed?
67. What was ordination?
68. How was the bishop aided? what did he administer?
34 69. What was administered to the dying?

## CHAPTER VII.—THE SIX ŒCUMENICAL SYNODS.—A. D. 320—680.

1. What dangers assailed the Church when persecution ceased?
2. What arch heretic first arose? the date?
3. How long did Arianism disturb the Church?
4. What was the doctrine it taught?
35 5. Of whom did the council at Nice consist? the date?
6. What was the decree pronounced?
7. What creed was then established and how was it received?
8. What did the Arians now strive to effect?
9. Who was the chief object of their hostility: of what was he accused?
10. What did the Meletians allege against him?
36 11. When was the Synod of Tyre held, and for what purpose?
12. Whither was Athanasius banished?
13. What was the end of Arius?
14. What became of Athanasius under Constantius?
37 15. To whom did he appeal?
16. When was the council of Sardica held, and what did it decide?
17. Relate the restoration of Athanasius?
38 18. Why were the Synods of Arles and Milan held, and where?
19. What remarkable escape had Athanasius?
39 20. When was the council of Ariminum held? what creed was there proposed? what temporary triumph was gained?
21. What did France and Italy declare?
22. What was done in Egypt about the same time?
23. What happened under Julian?
40 24. Describe the final triumph of the Nicene faith?
25. To what was Arianism indebted for its temporary power?

PAGE QUESTION.

41 26. What heresy next arose?
27. In what council was it condemned? when?
28. What other heresies broke out?
29. What heathen countries were converted?
30. What troubles now arose? where?
42 31. Who invaded Africa?
32. What was the influence on learning?
33. What did Pelagius teach? where did he live?
34. How were his doctrines generally regarded?
35. What did the council of Carthage decree? when?
43 36. Who was Nestorius? what did he teach?
37. When was the council of Ephesus held? what did it decree?
44 38. Whereddd the Nestorians establish themselves?
39. What error did Eutyches teach, who supported him?
40. When was the council of Chalcedon held: of how many bishops did it consist?
41. What decree did it pass?
42. What name is given to the adherents of Dioscorus?
45 43. What conversions took place about this time?
44. By whom was Ireland converted?
45. What Frank monarch received baptism? when?
46. What controversy now arose in the East?
47. Where was the 5th Œcumenical Synod held?
46 48. What mission was sent to Britain? by whom? when?
49. Did the ancient British Church still subsist?
50. What was the *Monothelite* heresy? who were its principal supporters?
47 51. What was the 6th Œcumenical Synod? when held?
52. What is said of Honorius of Rome?
53. What is to be observed of subsequent Synods?
54. What impostor now arose in the East? the date?
55. What became of the Church in Africa?
56. Has Christianity survived in the East?
48 67. What European nations were converted? by whom?

## CHAPTER VIII.—FRUITS OF FAITH.—SAINTS AND MARTYRS.

1. How has the promise of Christ been thus far verified?
49 2. Into what two classes may the holy men of this period be divided?
3. Who first exhibited the monastic life?
4. Is it easy to appreciate justly the ascetic system of this age?
5. What influence has the world upon the heart?
50 6. What was the practice of many of the early Christians?
7. What was the life they led?
8. What was their intention in so doing?
51 9. Of what country was Antony? when did he live?
10. Relate some particulars of his life?
52 11. What is said of his humility and learning? of his charity?
12. How did he regard Arianism?
53 13. What did he say of his burial?
14. What were the rules of the monasteries?
54 15. In what E. countries did this institution spread?
16. By whom was it introduced into the W.?
17. What duties were fulfilled by those who entered into it?
55 18. Into what errors did Eustathius fall?
19. What was the conduct of Simeon Stylites? his character?
56 20 Give an account of Hilary of Poictiers: of Eusebius of Vercellæ:

PAGE. QUESTION.

56 20. of Lucifer of Cagliari: Eusebius of Cæsarea: Cyril of Jerusalem?
57 21. What at first was the profession of St. Martin of Tours?
22. How is it said he was converted?
23. How did he behave among the robbers?
24. How did he conduct himself as bishop?
58 25. How did he treat the emperor Maximus?
26. Give some account of Basil: of what place was he bishop?
59 How was he distinguished against the Arians?
27. Also of Gregory of Nazianzum: of what places was he bishop?
60 28. Who was Ambrose? of what see was he archbishop? what was his character? how did he resist Theodosius?
61 29. For what was St. John Chrysostom distinguished? of what see was he bishop? why was he deposed? where did he die?
62 30. Give some account of Jerome.
31. Of what country was Augustine a native? what was his early life? how was he converted? of what see was he bishop? for what is
63 he celebrated?
32. Against what parties did Cyril of Alexandria, and Leo of Rome contend?
33. Who was St. Benedict?

## CHAPTER IX.—UNITY AND DISCIPLINE OF THE CHURCH.

1. What christian Church early obtained distinction? why?
64 2. What constituted the patriarchate of Rome? by whom approved?
3. What power did the council of Sardica give this see? was it generally approved of?
4. What encroachment was made in the 4th century? in the 5th and in the 6th?
5. What pretence was set up for this claim?
65 6. How was the asking of its *advice* interpreted?
7. Did any good effects result from the influence of this see?
8. What was forbidden in the third general council?
9. How did this apply to the case of Britain?
66 10. What rival see now rose into dignity? what were the several steps?
11. Who were the other patriarchs?
12. Was the Communion of the Church interrupted? in what cases?
67 Athanasius? Chrysostom? Acacius? 5th Synod?
13. What dispute arose between the British and Roman churches?
14. What effect had these withdrawals of communion?
68 15. What principle was still kept in view?

## CHAPTER X.—RISE OF ABUSES AND CORRUPTIONS.

68 1. Into what did the faith of the early christians sometimes degenerate: the causes?
2. How did the invocation of saints arise?
69 3. When was it first introduced into litanies?
4. How were the relics of saints and martyrs regarded?
5. What abuses hence arose?
6. When were they placed in churches?
70 7. What were pilgrimages?
8. What effect had they on the ancient discipline?
9. What use was made of pictures and sculpture?
10. What did Epiphanius? Serenus? Gregory the great? in relation to them.

PAGE. QUESTION.

71 11. What was the earliest miraculous gift in the Church? why?
12 What language did each nation employ in worship? give examples?
13. Why was the Latin language used in the west?
72 14. Where was it erroneously used?
15. What evil effect had its adoption?
16. What was the rule of the E. churches in relation to the marriage of the clergy?
17. When was it first prohibited in the W. church? and when finally
73 enforced?
18. What was the opinion of the early church as to the righteous after death?
19. What prayers did they offer? why?
20. State the opinion of Origen? of Augustine?
21. What view did Gregory the Great hold? how was it received?
74 22. When was the doctrine of purgatory declared an article of faith?

## CHAPTER XI.—PROGRESS OF CHRISTIANITY.—680—1054.

1. What was the general state of things during this period?
2. Was the authority of the laws regarded?
3. What incursions were made by barbarous nations?
4. Are we able to discern the fulfilment of Christ's promise and how?
75 5. What progress did the Saracens make?
6. Did they extirpate Christianity in the countries conquered?
7. Where did Boniface labour?
8. How was Bavaria converted?
9. What other countries received the gospel?
76 10. How did Charlemagne extend it?
11. What N. nations were converted?
12. What missions were carried on by the E. Church?
13. Give some account of the conversion of Russia?
14. — — of the Normans: of Poland?
77 15. — — of Hungary?

## CHAPTER XII.—FAITH OF THE CHURCH.

1. What doctrines were still universally believed?
2. What is said of Elipandus?
3. Of the Paulicians?
78 4. Of Berengarius?
5. How were the Scriptures regarded?
6. What was the chief controversy?
7. What superstitions prevailed in relation to images?
8. What Greek emperors opposed them?
79 9. What synod condemned their use?
10. How were they used in the W. Church at this time?
11. What did the synod at Nice decree?
12. How did the E. and W. Churches receive this decree?
13. How do their historians speak of this synod?
80 14. What was the course of the bishops of Rome?
15. What was the intention of the Church in allowing the use of images?
16. Why were they removed at the Reformation?
17. What was the opinion of Agobard?
18. What was the doctrine of the Church in relation to the Eucharist?
19. What view did Paschasius Ratbert hold?
81 20. What errors did Scotus fall into?

PAGE. QUESTION.

81 21. To what Churches was this controversy confined?
22. What was the practice as to private confession?
23. What views were held concerning its necessity?
82 24. What did the council of *Cavaillon* acknowledge?
25. What does Gratian say?
26. What did the council of Lateran direct?
27. What did many Romish writers still maintain?
83 28. What did the council of *Trent* decree?

## CHAPTER XIII.—FRUITS OF FAITH.

1. What difficulties did religion suffer under?
2. What usurpations and desecrations of Church revenues ensued?
3. With what were bishops and monasteries often invested? where?
4. Were churches and monasteries always respected?
5. What was the effect on learning?
84 6. Were these evils always regarded with unconcern?
7. What was the language of Hervey and his fellow bishops? what does he say of the clergy? of the laity?
85 8. What are the characteristics of the religion of this period?
9. What efforts were made for the heathen?
10. What was the conduct of many monarchs?
86 11. Who was Beda? state his learning—his works—his virtues—his letter to Egbert—his views as to the communion—his death—
87 what did he translate?
12. Give an account of Luitprand—
13. — — — Carloman—
88 14. — — — Charlemagne—of his zeal for religion—his charity—
15. — — — the emperor Louis.
89 16. Who was St. Boniface? where did he labour? why did he go to Rome? what proof is there of his courage? how did he esteem the Scriptures?
90 17. What was he made afterwards? what council did he hold?
18. What were his views of his office?
19. To what country did he afterwards go? what was his success?
91 20. Give an account of his death?
21. — — — of Gregory: how did he treat the robbers? show
92 his charity? his faith and devotion?
22. Give an account of *Lebuin*? his boldness for the truth?
93 23. What remarkable instance of martyrdom is related?
94 24. State the advice of Lupus to Godeschalch?
25. — the instructions of the council of Pavia?
26. How were the people instructed?
27. What did Jonas recommend?
28. For what was Wolfgang distinguished?
95 29. Who was Fidus? give some examples of his zeal?
30. Who was Alfred? show his reputation—his charity—his zeal for religion—his study of the Scriptures?
96 31. How did he restore learning? what school did he encourage? what works did he translate?
32. What does he say of the ignorance of the people?
97 33. How was his piety tried?
34. Give some account of Nilus—his mode of life—
98 35. his humility—his meekness—his poverty—
99 36. his view of rites—of the proper subjects of inquiry—his freedom from ambition—the honors he received from the pope?

PAGE. QUESTION.

100 37. For what did he censure his monks?
38. Why did he not seek the company of the great?

CHAPTER XIV—ABUSES AND CORRUPTIONS.

1. What were the effects of the ignorance and disorder of this period?
101 2. What is said of the invocation of saints?
3. To what was the ignorance of religion in a great degree owing?
4. What means of instruction still existed?
5. What attention was paid to the Eucharist?
6. What parable of our Lord was now illustrated?
102 7. What was the condition of the monasteries?
8. What is said of Odo?
9. What effect had the temporal possessions granted to the clergy?
10. What interference of princes was caused?
103 11. What authority did the bishops assume?
12. State the case of Wamba: of Louis le Debonnaire?
13. Of Adrian II. and Charles the Bald: of Gregory IV.?
14. For what causes were excommunications granted?
15. What forgery was now devised?
104 16. What was the purport of these epistles?
17. By whom were they supported?
18. What injury to the discipline of Churches was occasioned?

CHAPTER XV.—DIVISION OF E. AND W. CHURCHES.

1. What part did the popes take in the image controversy?
2. What did the E. emperors do?
105 3. What was the effect?
4. What was the view of the W. Church generally?
5. What dispute arose in the 9th century?
6. State the case of Photius?
7. How was the matter settled?
106 8. What new controversy arose in the 11th century?
9. How was it occasioned?
10. What did the legate of Rome demand?
11. What was the result?

CHAPTER XVI.—PROGRESS OF CHRISTIANITY.—1054—1517.

1. What are the characteristics of this period?
107 2. What spirit pervaded the Romish see?
3. What works were still carried on?
4. Who was Boleslaus? whom did he invite?
5. What measures did Otto take?
6. Where did he first go? how was he received?
108 7. Describe his exhortations: his mode of baptism?
109 8. What instructions did he give his converts?
10. Whither did he afterwards proceed?
11. State his boldness at Stetten?
110 12. Relate the particulars of his second visit?
13. What N. Island was converted?
14. What idol did they worship?
15. What warning do we hence derive?
111 16. What other N. nation was converted?

PAGE. QUESTION.

111 17. What change was effected with the Armenians?
18. — — and the Maronites?
19. State the introduction of the Gospel into Livonia?
20. — — — — — — into Prussia?
112 21. What checks did the Saracens receive?
22. What efforts were made in Tartary? and in China?
23. What European nation was last converted?
24. What effect had the conquests of the Portugusese?
25. — — — — and of the Spaniards?

## CHAPTER XVII.—THE FAITH OF THE CHURCH.

113 1. In what respects did the faith of the E. and W. Churches still agree?
2. What was the chief point of doctrinal differences?
3. What was held on the subject of purgatory?
4. What doctrines were universally maintained?
114 5. What heretics were condemned?
6. What did the Lateran council decree?
7. What did the W. Church hold as to the cause of man's salvation?
8. How is this proved?
115 9. What error was afterwards introduced? and by whom?
116 10. What claim of the popes was now made an article of faith?
11. Did the E. Church allow it?
12. What did the synod of Florence decree as to purgatory?
117 13. When was the doctrine of transubstantiation established?
14. Was the *word* used by all in the same sense?
15. What is said of the existence of errors in the Church?

## CHAPTER XVIII.—FRUITS OF FAITH.

118 1. Give an account of the early days of St. Anselm?
2. What did he afterwards become? what were his studies?
119 3. What promotion did he receive from William Rufus?
4. What is remarkable in his election and consecration?
5. Why did he retire from his see?
6. How was he received in Italy?
120 7. When did he return to England and what was his after course?
8. What was the character of Anselm?
121 9. Give an account of St. Bernard?
10. How did he study the Scriptures?
122 11. Of what monastery was he made abbot? its character?
12. What influence had Bernard?
123 13. What is said of Homobonus?
14. — — of the Schoolmen?
15. Give an account of St. Francis?
16. — — of Richard of Chichester?
124 17. — — of Robert Grosteste: what claims did he oppose?
125 18. What abuses did he complain of?
19. Name some other eminent theologians?
126 20. Who was Justiniani? show his fortitude?
21. What virtues did he possess?
127 22. When was he made bishop? how did he conduct himself?
23. Give the particulars of his death?
128 24. What had now become common in the Church?
25. What were still preserved?
129 26. State the testimony of Luther?

## CHAPTER XIX.—THE EASTERN CHURCH.

PAGE. QUESTION.

129 1. In what countries did this Church exist?
2. By what patriarchs was it governed?
3. Was all communion broken off with the W. Church? give proofs to the contrary?
4 What was the conduct of the popes?
130 5. What benefits resulted from the resistance of the E. Church?
6. State the language of the archbishop Nechites?
131 7. What effect had the crusades?
8. What efforts did Michael Paleologus make?
9. What was done at the council of Lyons? the result?
10. What measures were taken at the council of Florence?
11. Was the union effected?
132 12. When and by whom was Constantinople taken?

## CHAPTER XX.—ABUSES AND CORRECTIONS.

1. What was the grand evil of this period?
2. What was the spirit of the court of Rome?
3. What were their maxims?
133 4. What followed from them?
5. What powerful engine was employed?
6. Who developed the full extent of the papal power?
7. Over what countries did he extend his jurisdiction?
134 8. How did he manage the affairs of the Church?
9. Who were legates?
10. What does the history of Europe present during this period?
11. What contested elections took place?
135 12. What Church suffered severely in the 13th century? the particulars?
136 13. How were the Italians enriched?
14. What did the pope claim as to the clergy who died intestate?
15. What taxes did he try to lay on the clergy?
137 16. Were their claims resisted?
17. How were appeals to the pope carried on? the effects?
18. What dispensations were given? the consequence?
138 19. What appointments did they claim?
20. What were plenary indulgences?
139 21. By whom was the papal supremacy chiefly sustained.
22. What was the character of the monks?
23. How had they degenerated from their predecessors?
24. Who were the begging friars?
140 25. What does Richard of Armagh say of them?
26. What had the monasteries become?
141 27. What was the general character of the clergy?
28. In what way was penitence evaded?
142 29. What new office was invented? when?
30. What was the rosary?
31. What charms were worn?
32. What mode of absolution was used by the mendicant friars?
33. What abuses in relation to the eucharist were introduced?
143 34. What was the system of theological instruction? when was it given?
35. What was the *Book of Sentences?*
144 36. What was the text book of the canonists? its character?
37. What effect had these works on learning?
145 38. Was scripture still studied?
39. State the complaints of the university of Paris?
40. What was to be expected from this state of things?

CHAPTER XXI.—THE FOREIGN REFORMATION: 1517—&c

PAGE. QUESTION.

146 1. What was the effect of the power of the popes?
2. What was the *great schism!*
3. What councils were assembled? their effect?
4. What reformers existed at this time?
5. What revived in the 15th century?
147 6. By whom was the Reformation commenced? the date?
7. What was his intention at first?
8. Why was he excommunicated? when?
9. What was the effect of this separation
148 10. What protectors did he find?
11. What did his piety call forth?
12. What system of church government was established?
13. What was the effect of the 2nd diet at Spires?
14. What is the meaning of the term Protestant?
15. Has the Church of England adopted it?
16. What diet was now convened? its date?
17. What was the confession there presented?
149 18. What was the result of the diet?
19. What did the Protestants then do?
20. What conference was held at Ratisbon?
21. What council was now called? when? by whom attended?
22. What did the emperor do?
23. What was the *Interim?*
24. When did the council of Trent assemble? its effect?
150 25. What led to a pacification? its result?
26. Whether did the Reformation spread?
27. What good results followed?
28. What is said of Sweden?
29. What error did the Lutherans fall into subsequently?
30. What was their condition in the 17th century?
151 31. — — — — 18th century?
32. What party now arose? who was its leader? the effects?
33. Where else did a Reformation begin? its author?
34. What were his views and their results?
152 35. What reformer succeeded him? what system did he invent?
36. What was the progress of the Reformation in France?
37. Whose doctrines did the party adopt?
38. What edict was passed? when revoked?
39. What revolution took place in Holland?
40. Whose system was adopted?
41. What is to be observed of the *reformed* communities?
153 42. State the early life of Luther? what order did he enter?
43. To what studies did he apply himself?
44. Why did he go to Rome? the effect?
45. What led him to examine deeply into existing abuses?
46. How did he at first conduct the controversy?
47. Did he *voluntarily* leave the Church of Rome?
154 48. To what diet was he called? show his firmness?
49. Whither was he conveyed? in what did he employ himself?
50. Why did he leave his retreat?
51. What was his influence? what works did he compose?
52. Who succeeded Luther? what were his attainments?
53. How was he brought over?
54. Name some of his writings?
155 55. For what was he remarkable? was he successful?
56. What is said of the early life of Calvin?

PAGE. QUESTION.

155 57. To what profession did he apply himself?
58. What was the consequence?
59. What work did he publish?
60. In what town did he settle? why?
61. What executions did he make? the result?
156 62. When was he recalled? what did he establish?
63. What did he oppose? state his influence?
64. What was his character?
65. Was he ever in *holy orders?*
66. What excuse is given by his supporters?
67. Is it safely to be relied on?
68. Where was Zuingle born? where did he study?
69. Where was he made pastor?
70. What effect did his studies produce?
71. To what church was he appointed? and the consequence?
157 72. What controversies ensued? the issue?
73. What reforms did he effect?
74. What dispute had he with Luther?

## CHAPTER XXII.—ON THE BRITISH CHURCHES.

1. How long had the church in Britain existed?
2. How long was it independent of the Romish see?
3. How was the jurisdiction obtained;
158 4. Were appeals at first allowed?
5. When was the papal authority fully established?
6. What was the state of religion?
7. What efforts did Wickliffe make?
8. What led to the Reformation in England?
9. Give the history of the proceedings?
159 10. To what expedient did Henry resort?
11. What was the decision? and the result?
12. What did the convocation declare?
13. What exactions were abolished? the date?
14. What was enacted as to the election &c. of bishops?
15. — — as to the right of appeal? as to licences, &c. &c.?
160 16. Was this agreed to by the Church of England? when and where?
17. What work was published in 1537? what in 1543?
18. What doctrine was disclaimed? what abuses forbidden?
19. What superstitions were prohibited?
20. What penal laws were passed? when?
21. What was Henry acknowledged to be?
161 22. What did he do in virtue thereof? the result?
23. Who succeeded Henry? the date?
24. What reforms were made? by whose authority?
25. What was done with the public prayers?
26. How did the popes now regard England?
27. Did the Church in England separate from the communion of the W. Church?
28. What was the opinion of the papal party?
29. Who succeeded Edward? the date?
162 30. Who became ascendant?
31. How many bishops were expelled?
32. How replaced?
33. Had the pope any right of jurisdiction? why not?
34. What did the parliament do? what the pope?
35. What persecution arose? relate the particulars?

PAGE. QUESTION.

36. Who succeeded Mary? the date?
37. What laws were re-enacted?
38. What was done with the popish intruders?
39. What was the view of the clergy generally?
40. What formulary was published? when?
41. What state of things now existed?
42. What was issued by the pope? when?
43. What was the effect on the papists?
44. When was the Romish separation commenced?
45. When did they obtain bishops?
46. What other separation took place?
47. Give an account of the authors?
48. What did they say of the Church?
49. When did their numbers increase? and why?
50. What was enacted by the parliament?
51. Under whom was the Church restored?
52. What was the course of James II.? his fate?
53. Who were the non-jurors?
54. What controversy was occasioned?
55. Who was Hoadly? and what did he maintain?
56. What notice did the convocation take? the issue?
57. By whom was he protected?
58. What attacks were made on subscription?
59. Who founded the Methodists? the design? the result?
60. From what causes did the Church suffer?
61. What dangers aroused it to exertion?
62. What revival ensued? how manifested?
63. What has continued to stimulate the Church?
64. What enemies has she to encounter at the present time?
65. How long was the Church of Ireland independent?
66. When was a legate sent there? and the pall received?
67. When was the papal jurisdiction abolished?
68. What was done under Mary?
69. What under Elizabeth?
70. How were the Irish clergy affected?
71. What formularies of faith were adopted? the dates?
72. Whom did the pope send to Ireland?
73. What was the effect on the people?
74. What instances are given in the text?
75. What orders did Maceogan give?
76. What advantage was taken of the superstition of the Irish?
77. What was the result of these rebellions?
78. What did James I. forbid?
79. What broke out under Charles I.?
80. By whom was the Church persecuted?
81. What has been its state recently?
82. What were lately suppressed?
83. When did Scotland become subject to the pope?
84. By whom was the Reformation introduced? when?
85. What was established under Melville? the date?
86. When did these disorders cease?
87. Who became predominant afterwards?
88. What was done at the restoration?
89. — — after the accession of William? why?
90. How was *the Church* subsequently treated?
91. When and how was the Church planted by England in N. America?
92. What hindered its growth?
93. Who was the first bishop after the independence of the U. States?

PAGE. QUESTION.

94. Who were afterwards consecrated?
95. What schismatical and spurious episcopacies exist?
96. What is the present state of the American Church?
97. In what English possessions have bishoprics been established?

## CHAPTER XXIII.—FRUITS OF FAITH IN THE BRITISH CHURCHES.

1. Who stands prominent in the list of martyrs?
2. Where did he study?
173 3. What is said of his preaching? and knowledge?
4. Why did he change his opinions on the Eucharist? and when?
5. Of what see was he consecrated bishop?
6. Show his conscientiousness?
174 7. To what see was he promoted? what was his character?
8. State his devotion: his concern for the poor?
9. What is said of his sermon on charity and its effects on the king?
175 10. What institutions were founded in consequence?
11. What happened on the accession of Mary?
12. Show his constancy in prison?
176 13. What did his chaplain recommend?
14. State his reply: and his charge?
177 15. What was the effect?
16. Whither was he removed and with whom?
17. Before whom was he examined? what was his conduct?
18. What was the sentence?
19. How did he behave on the eve of his death?
178 20. — and on the morn of his execution?
21. What did he say to Latimer? what to the sermon?
22. How did he behave at the stake?
23. What did Latimer say?
179 24. Was he long in suffering? was Ridley?
25. What may be said of his death?
26. What is said of Hooker's early days?
180 27. Who provided for his education?
28. To what college was he sent?
29. What is said of his devotion? his virtue? his conduct?
30. What appointments did he receive?
181 31. By what was the Church troubled?
32. Who was Hooker's opponent? for what reason?
33. Who supported Hooker?
34. What great work did Hooker undertake? where was it written?
35. What did the pope say of it?
182 36. To what parish was he now appointed? what of his life?
37. What is said of his attention to his duties?
38. What friend attended him in his last illness?
183 39. On what did he profess to rely for justification?
40. What did he say in his last moments?
41. What is said of the education, &c. of Nicholas Ferrar?
184 42. What did he do while abroad?
43. What employment did he hold?
44. What offer did he decline?
45. Of what body was he elected a member?
46. Whither did he retire and with whom?
47. What was he ordained: and what was his vow?
48. What offers did he refuse? why?
186 49. What edifice was repaired?
50. What did he establish; in what was he diligent?

PAGE. QUESTION.

186 51. What was the routine on Sundays?
52. What on week days?
187 53. To what were their leisure hours devoted?
54. Who visited the Society? what did he say of it?
55. What king also visited them?
188 56. Describe the end of Ferrar?
57. What is said of the early days of Hammond?
58. — — of his learning?
59. Where was he settled? what of his duties?
60. Why was he obliged to leave?
189 61. What persecutions did he suffer?
62. What is said of his habits and devotion?
63. — — of his forgiveness and humility? his alms?
190 64. At what time did he die?
65. What is said of the ordination and resolutions of bishop Wilson?
66. Who was his patron? how did he benefit him?
191 67. To what see was he appointed?
68. Whence did he obtain aid in his duties?
69. What was the state of his diocese?
70. To what did he direct his attention?
71. What is said of his charity?
192 72. What provision did he make for the poor?
73. What did he improve?
74. What is said of his diligence in preaching, &c.?
75. How did he attend to the clergy?
76. What did he address to them?
193 77. What is said of his devotion? of his conversation?
78. What exercise of discipline did he inflict? the result?
194 79. State the particulars of his death?
80. Mention some other worthies?
81. Which are the oldest Societies in the Church of England for the diffusion of the Gospel?
82. Who was their chief founder?
83. What is the object of the Society for the propagation of the Gospel?
195 84. — — of that for promoting Christian knowledge?
85. When was the Church Missionary Society formed?

## CHAPTER XXIV.—THE ROMAN CHURCHES.

1. What Churches remained under the papal jurisdiction?
2. When did the council of Trent close?
3. What errors did it establish?
196 4. How were its decrees received?
5. Was this according to primitive usage?
6. To what authority is this council entitled?
7. When was the Society of Jesuits established?
8. What disputes arose in the Romish Church?
9. What controversy was introduced by Jansenius?
197 10. Where did his doctrines find their chief support?
11. What partial reformation took place in Germany?
12. What monarch advocated it? the result?
13. What other countries imitated him?
14. What is said of the Jansenists in Holland?
15. Who chiefly opposed them?
198 16. Whence arises their power? what made them popular?
17. What are their characteristics? who exposed them?
199 18. When were they suppressed? when revived?

PAGE. QUESTION.

199 19. What spirit long existed in France?
20. What effect had the Revolution?
21. What pretended reorganization took place? the issue?
22. What negotiations did Buonaparte carry on and what was the result?
200 23. What did he afterwards extinguish? permanently?
24. What was done with the monasteries?
25. What actual temporal power has the pope now?
26. Give an account of the labours of Francis Xavier?
27. — — of the establishment of the Romish Church in China?
201 28. — — — among the Syrian Christians of India?
29. — — — in South America?
30. What abuses did the council of Trent reform?
31. What mode of argument was adopted in the 17th century?
32. What effect had it?
33. What influence have the Jesuits produced on morality?

## CHAPTER XXV.—FRUITS OF FAITH IN THE ROMAN CHURCHES.

202 1. What may still be produced in these Churches?
2. What are we hence guarded against?
3. Where was Francis Xavier educated? when ordained?
4. What application was made to the pope?
5. Whither was Xavier sent? how did he employ himself on the voyage?
6. Where did he land? what was the state of the residents?
7. What measures did he adopt?
204 8. What good effect was produced?
9. Among whom did he then labour? the result?
10. To what kingdom did he then proceed?
205 11. What other places did he visit? what islands?
12. What did he say of his dangers?
13. To what countries did he next go? state his quickness in learning?
14. Where did he next purpose going?
206 15. Who was Charles Borromeo? what were his connexions?
16. What was he made? what did he found?
17. What is said of his household? what urged him to reform?
207 18. Where did he commence?
19. What did he strive to exemplify?
208 20. How did he show his liberality?
21. In what condition was his diocese?
22. What discipline was introduced?
23. What attempt was made, and by whom?
24. How did he employ his revenues?
209 25. What of his visitations? his habits of piety? his virtues?
210 26. What of the early life of Francis de Sales?
27. For what was he intended? what profession did he choose?
28. What is said of his preaching?
211 29. Where was he appointed to labour? what of his influence?
30. When was he appointed bishop? state his plan of life?
212 31. Show his attention to his duties?
213 32. — his disinterestedness, and concientiousness?
33. What was the effect of his preaching at Paris?
214 34. What is said of his death?
35. What of the early life of Vincent de Paul?
36. What happened to him? how did he endure his captivity?
215 37. What effect had he on his owner?
38. What employment had he on returning to France?
216 39. What Benevolent Societies did he found?
40. What virtues did he exhibit?

### CHAPTER XXVI.—THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES.

PAGE. QUESTION.

216 1. What of the faith and discipline of the Greek Churches?
2. What did the Lutherans seek?
217 3. What intercourse was had with the English Church?
4. What error was embraced by some in the Greek Church? when?
5. When did the Russian Church become independent?
6. What changes did Peter the Great make?
7. What change has been made in Greece?
8. What accession has the Greek Church gained?

### CHAPTER XXVII.—RISE AND PROGRESS OF INFIDELITY.

218 1. Who was the leader among the infidel party? to what was his life devoted?
2. What was the watchword of the party?
219 3. What unbelievers had England produced?
4. What natural abilities had Voltaire?
5. What was his private character?
6. What design did he form? whose aid did he obtain?
220 7. What was the object of this association?
8. What words did they make use of?
9. What was the principal engine they used? its character?
10. What circulation had it?
221 11. What supporters did infidelity obtain?
12. What was the state of morals in France?
222 13. What means were used to disseminate infidelity among the low?
14. Were supporters found among the clergy? why?
15. What was the death of Voltaire?
223 16. What did the seed produce?
17. What effect had it upon the Church?
18. Are the evils still experienced in France?
224 19. What form has unbelief assumed in Germany?
20. Describe its characteristics?
21. What error has been widely spread in England?
225 22. What is the present garb of infidelity?
23. What is the spirit of this age?
24. What are the duties of the Church?

### CHAPTER XXVIII.—CONCLUSION.

1. What truth is clear through the progress of the Church?
2. What great doctrine has been steadily preserved?
230 3. What creeds are universally accepted?
4. Whom do all Churches confess?
5. What do they allow as to the condition of man?
6. What do they believe as to Divine grace?
7. — — as to the judgment to come?
8. — — as to the Holy Scriptures?
9. What of the Sacraments and of the Apostolic succession?
10. To what does the differences between them chiefly relate?
11. What truths do many schismatics retain?
12. What union was enjoined by our Lord?
13. What has been the main cause of present divisions?
14. On what way do the Romish superstitions chiefly depend?
15. What else have we to deplore besides disunion?
16. What has every Church and age to fear?
17. What are opposite evils to the facts of usurpation and bigotry?
18. What Apostolic precept must be constantly remembered?
19. What is there to console us in the history of the Church?

# INDEX.


African Churches, 26.
Agobard, 80.
Albigenses, heretics, 114.
Alexandria, Church of, 8.
Alfred, king, 95.
Alsatia, converted, 76.
Ambrose, 60.
America, Church of, 171.
Ammon, 53.
Amorium, martyrs of, 93.
Anabaptists, 164.
Anselm, 118–120.
Antioch, council of, 12, 25, 36.
Antony, 51.
Apollinaris, heretic, 41.
Arabians, converted, 45.
Arianism, 34–40.
Ariminum, synod of, 39.
Arius, heretic, 34, 35, 36.
Armenia, 34, 111.
Artemon, 12.
Articles of the English Church, 163.
Asia Minor, 7, 15–18.
Athanasius, 35–40.
Augsburg, diet of, 148.
Augsburg, confession of, 148, 151.
Augustine, 62.
Augustine, of Canterbury, 46.
Baptism, 27; of infants, ibid.
Baptists, 164.
Basil the Great, 58.
Basire, archdeacon, 217.
Batavians, converted, 48.
Bavaria, converted, 75.
Bede, venerable, 85.
Benedict, 63.
Benedict of Anianum, 102.
Berengarius, heretic, 75, 81.
Bernard of Clairvaux, 121.
Bishops, 33.
Bohemia, converted, 75.
Boniface, 88–90.
Borromeo, cardinal, 205–210.
Bossuet, 201.
Bray, Dr. 194.
Brienne, cardinal de, 222.
Bulgaria, converted, 76.
Buonaparte, 199.
Calvin, 155.
Canon law, 143.
Carinthia, converted, 75.
Carloman, 87.
Celibacy of clergy, 72.
Chalcedon, synod of, 44.
Charlemagne, emperor, 75, 87.
Charles I., king, 187, 189, 217.
China, Christianity introduced, 112.
Chrysostom, 60.
Clement of Rome, 25.
Clement of Alexandria, 23.
Columban, 47, 139.
Communion in one kind, introduced, 142; of the sick, 34.
Confession, 32, 81, 142.
Confirmation, 28.
Congo, converted, 112.
Constantine the Great, 10.
Constantinople, patriarch of, 64, 104.
Constantinople, I. synod of, 41.
Constantinople, II. synod of, 45.
Constantinople, III. synod of 47.
Constantinople, synod of, in 754, 79.
Cornelius of Rome, 26.

Courland, converted, 112.
Cranmer, archbishop, 159, 162, 173, 177.
Creeds, 30; Apostles', ibid. Nicene, 31.
Cyprian, 23, 26.
Cyril of Alexandria, 43.
Cyril of Jerusalem, 57.
Cyrillus Lucaris, 217.
D'Alembert, 220.
Dalmatia, converted, 76.
Decretals, spurious, 103, 104.
Denmark, Christianity introduced, 76.
Diocletian, 15.
Dionysius of Alexandria, 23.
Dionysius of Corinth, 25.
Dioscorus, heretic, 44.
Discipline of the scourge, introduced, 141.
Divisions of Churches, 26, 27, 66, 104–105.
Domitian, 15.
Donatists, 26.
Edessa, Church of, 8.
Elevation of eucharist, introduced, 142.
Elipandus, heretic, 77.
England, Reformation in, 159–163.
Ephesus, 8, 15.
Ephesus, synod of, 43.
Episcopacy, 8, 33.
Ethiopia, converted, 41.
Eucharist, 22, 29, 80, 142.
Eunomius, heretic, 59.
Eusebius of Cæsarea, 56.
Eusebius of Nicomedia, 36.
Eutyches, heretics, 44.
Excommunication, abused, 103.
Ferrar, Nicholas, 183–187.
Fidus of Meissen, 95.
Florence, synod of, 131.
France, Reformation in, 152.
Francis of Assisium, 123.
Frankfort, synod, against worship of images, 79.
Franks, converted, 45, 48.
Frederick, II. 220.
Friars, begging, 139.
Friesland, Christianity introduced, 25.
Frumentius, 41.
Gallican Church, 199.
Gall, 48.
Georgia, converted, 41.
Germany, Reformation there, 147, &c.
Gnostics, 13, 23.
Goa, Christianity there, 200, 201.
Goths, converted, 41.
Gratian, 143.
Greece, Church of, 217.
Gregory the Great, 46.
Gregory the Illuminator, 34.
Gregory Nazianzen, 58.
Gregory Thaumaturgus, 23.
Gregory of Utrecht, 91.
Grosteste, bishop, 124.
Hammond, 188–190.
Henry VIII. 158–161.
Hervey, archbishop of Rheims, 84.
Hesse, Christianity introduced, 75.
Hilary of Poictiers, 39.
Hoadly, heretic, 165.
Holland, Reformation in, 151.
Homobonus, 123.
Homoüsion, 35.
Honorius of Rome, heretics, 47.
Hooker, 179–183.
Hungary, converted, 76.
Inconoclasts, 78.
Ignatius, 20.
Image-worship, 78–80.
Independents or Brownists, 164.
India, conversions in, 202, 203.
Indulgences, 141.
Interim, the, 149.
Invocation of saints, 68, 101, 110.
Ireland, converted, 45.
Ireland, Church of, 169; Reformation there, 169; schism of Romanists, 170, 171.
Irenæus, 9, 11, 23.
Jansenists, 196.
Japan, Christianity there, 205.
Jerome, 62.
Jesuits, 196, 198, 199, 200, 202.
John, apostle, 15.
John Chrysostom, 60.
Julius of Rome, 37, 64.
Justin Martyr, 9, 23.
Justiniani, Laurence, 125–128.

Kempis, Thomas à, 125.
Kilian, 48.
Lanfranc, 118.
Latimer, bishop, 177–179.
Laud, archbishop, 185, 188.
Lebuin, 92.
Leo the Great, 44, 63.
Libanus, converted, 45.
Lithuania, converted, 112.
Liturgy, language of, 71, 72, 101.
Liturgies, 31.
Livonia, converted, 111.
Lord's supper. See Eucharist.
Lucifer of Cagliari, 39, 56.
Luitprand, 87.
Luther, 147, 153.
——— his opinion of the Church, 128.
Lyra, 125.
Macedonius, heretic, 41.
Mahomet, 47.
Maronites, converted, 111.
Marriage, 22; of clergy, 72, 160.
Martin of Tours, 41, 57.
Melancthon, 154.
Meletius of Antioch, 57.
Mendicants, 139.
Menezes, archbishop, 201.
Methodists, 166.
Monastic life, 49, &c.
Monks, their corruptions, 139–141.
Monophysites, heretics, 44.
Monothelites, heretics, 46.
Nechites, 130.
Nectarius, 32.
Nero, 14.
Nestorius, heretic, 43.
Nice, synod of, 35.
Nice, synod for images, 79.
Nicene Creed, 35.
Nilus of Calabria, 97–99.
Noëtus, 12.
Non-jurors, 165.
Normans, converted, 76.
Novatians, 26.
Ockham, 125.
Odo, of Clugny, 102.
Origen, 10, 23.
Otto of Bamberg, 108–110.
Oxford, University of, 96, 143.
Pachomius, 53.
Papists, their separation from the Churches of England and Ireland, 163, 168–170.
Paschasius Radbert, 80.
Patrick, 45.
Paul, apostle, 8, 15.
Paul, Vincent de, 214–216.
Paul of Samosata, 12.
Paulicians, heretics, 77.
Pelagius, heretic, 42.
Penitence, 32, 70, 141.
Penitentiaries, 32.
Peter, apostle, 6, 8, 15.
Peter Lombard, 123, 143.
Photinus, heretic, 41.
Pictures of saints, 70.
Pilgrimages, 70.
Pliny, 8, 12.
Poland, converted, 76.
Polycarp, 16–20.
Pomerania, converted, 107–110.
Popes, temporal power of, 103, 133–138; taxes imposed by them, 135–138; appeals to them, 137; dispensations, 137; usurpations of patronage, 138.
Praxeas, 12.
Prayers for the dead, 73, 74.
Procession of Holy Spirit, 113.
Protestants, origin of the term, 148.
Prussia, converted, 111.
Purgatory, 73, 113, 114.
Puritans, origin of, 164.
Rationalism in Germany, 151, 224.
Ratisbon, conference of, 149.
Relics, 69.
Richard of Chichester, 123.
Ridley, martyr, 172–179.
Roman Church, 7; its charity, 26
Rome, patriarchate of, 64; jurisdiction of, its origin and increase, 64–66, 116, 130, 133, &c
Rosary, invented, 142.
Rugen, isle of, converted, 110.
Russia, converted, 76; Church of, 217.
Sabellius, 12.
Sales, Frances de, 210–214.
Saracens, their ravages, 74, 75.
Sardica, synod of, 37, 64.

Scapulary, invented, 142.
Scotland, Reformation there, 170; Presbyterian schism, 171.
Simeon Stylites, 55.
Smalcald, league of, 149.
Smyrna, 16.
Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, 194; for propagating the Gospel, 195; Church Missionary, 195.
Stephen of Rome, 26.
Suevi, converted, 48.
Switzerland, converted, 48.
Switzerland, reformation there, 151.
Tacitus, 8, 14.
Tartary, Christianity introduced, 112.
Tertullian, 9, 23.
Thaddæus, apostle, 8.
Theodotus, heretic, 12.
Thuringia, Christianity introduced, 75.
Transubstantiation, 81, 116.
Travancore, converted, 204.
Trent, council of, 162, 196, 201.
Troslè, syod of, 84.
Tyre, synod of, 36.
Universities, 143.
Unknown language, in the Liturgy. See Liturgy.
Victor, 12, 25.
Virgin, office in honour of her, 142.
Voltaire, 218–222.
Westphalia, converted, 48.
Whitgift, archbishop, 181.
Wickliffe, 146, 158.
Willibrord, 48.
Wilson, bishop, 190–194.
Wesley, 166.
Xavier, 200, 202–205.
Zuingle, 151, 156.

## EXPLANATION OF DIFFICULT WORDS.

*Alb*, a vestment of the clergy.
*Almoner*, a person who distributes alms.
*Amphitheatre*, a place for public amusements.
*Anathema*, excommunication, the severest censure of the Church.
[*Annates*, the first year's income of a benefice.]
*Ascetics*, devout persons, given up to a life of religion.
*Asiarch*, the principal heathen priest of Asia Minor.
*Baptistery*, a place for administering baptism.
*Canons*, ecclesiastical laws made by synods, also certain of the clergy.
*Catholic*, universal, or universally received.
*Convocation*, an assembly of the clergy.
*Council*, an assembly of bishops.
*Heresy*, an obstinate denial or perversion of some article of the faith.
*Iconoclasts*, image-breakers.
*Irenarch*, a magistrate who watched over the public peace.
[*Legate*, an ambassador of the Pope, generally a cardinal.]
[*Mandate*, a command to the patron of a benefice to bestow it on a particular person.]
*Matins*, morning service.
*Metropolitan*, a bishop who has the chief authority amongst the bishops of a province.
[*Nuncio*, a messenger of the Pope.]
*Oratory*, a private chapel.
*Œcumenical Synod*, an assembly of bishops from all parts of the world.
*Orisons*, prayers.
*Pall*, an ornament worn originally by Patriarchs, afterwards by metropolitans.
*Patriarch*, a bishop who has authority over metropolitans.
*Proconsul*, a Roman governor.
*Schism*, a criminal division in the Church, or a voluntary separation from it.
*Synod*, an assembly of bishops.
*Temporalities*, the property of the Church.
*Vigil*, watching at night with prayer.

LIST OF WORKS ON CHURCH HISTORY, MOSTLY OF A POPULAR CHARACTER, WHICH MAY BE PROFITABLY READ BY THOSE WHO DESIRE FULLER INFORMATION THAN THIS COMPENDIUM AFFORDS.

On the EARLY CHURCH. Burton's History of the Church in the First three Centuries, 12mo. An American edition.

R. W. Evans' Biography of the Early Church, 2 vols. 12mo forming part of Rivington's Theological Library, London. A delightful book, well worthy of re-publication.

Burton's Lectures on the History of the Church in the First Century, 8vo. London.

Burton's Lectures on the History of the Church in the Second and Third Centuries, 8vo. London. Addressed to theological students, and admirably adapted for their use, and that of clergymen.

On the ENGLISH CHURCH. T. V. Short's History of the Church of England, second edition, 8vo. London.

Carwithen's History of the Church of England, 3 vols. 8vo. London.

On the REFORMATION. Le Bas' Life of Wiclif, 12mo.
Le Bas' Life of Cranmer, 2vols. 12mo.
Le Bas' Life of Jewel, 12mo.
Le Bas' Life of Laud, 12mo.

Of this series, forming part of Rivington's Theological Library, only the first three volumes have been re-published in this country, in Harper's Theological Library. The others, not at all inferior in value, are necessary to complete the view of the English Reformation in its successive stages.

Blunt's Sketch of the Reformation of the Church of England, 12mo. An American edition.

On the AMERICAN CHURCH. White's Memoirs of the Protestant Episcopal Church, second edition, 8vo. Swords.

Chandler's Life of Dr. Samuel Johnson, 12mo. Swords.

McVickar's Life of Bishop Hobart, 12mo.

Hawks' Histories of the Church in Virginia and Maryland, 2 vols. 8vo. New-York.

AN

# APOLOGY

FOR

# APOSTOLIC ORDER

AND ITS

# ADVOCATES.

IN A SERIES OF LETTERS,

ADDRESSED

TO THE REV. JOHN M. MASON, D. D.

---

BY

THE REV. JOHN HENRY HOBART,

AN ASSISTANT MINISTER OF TRINITY CHURCH.

---

Judge righteous judgment.
*John* viii. 24.

FOURTH EDITION.

WITH NOTES AND AN INDEX.

---

NEW-YORK:
STANFORD & SWORDS, 139 BROADWAY.
PHILADELPHIA:
GEO. S. APPLETON, 148 CHESNUT ST.
MDCCCXLVI.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the Year 1844,
By STANFORD & SWORDS,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the Southern District
of New-York.

STEREOTYPED BY VINCENT L. DILL,
No. 128 Fulton Street, New-York.

## EDITOR'S PREFACE.

No words are here needed to justify the republication of a book, so valuable in itself, so urgently demanded by the exigences of the time, as the "Apology" for the one Catholic Church, from the able pen of the late Bishop of New-York, which first appeared in 1807. The republication has been delayed in the hope that some skilful hand might be found to divest it somewhat of its personalities without diminishing its force; a task, which, upon examination, has proved impracticable. The circumstance, however, is hardly to be regretted, as the "strictures and denunciations" which called forth this triumphant defence of the truth, have recently been given to the public, in all the offensiveness of their original forms. No alteration, therefore, has been made in this *second* edition of the "Apology;" and no other addition than a few notes and an index by the Editor.

*New-York, Nov. 8th.* 1843. L. S. I.

# PREFACE.

The writer of the following letters and his opinions having been pointedly and violently assailed in the Christian's Magazine, he is reluctantly compelled to obtrude himself upon the public attention. He thinks he has a particular claim upon all those who have taken up unfavourable views of those opinions which that Magazine assails, for a candid perusal of his defence. In that work he has been solemnly arraigned "at the bar of public criticism." The readers of that publication cannot, therefore, he conceives, consistently with their regard to justice, their love of truth, or the claims of duty, refuse to hear him in his defence. It is the first dictate of *justice*, to give an accused person a patient and candid hearing before judgment is passed on him. The impartial pursuit of *truth* cannot be compatible with an examination of only one side of a disputed question. And they who will place themselves for a moment in the situation of the individual whom that Magazine denounces as holding opinions of "deep-toned horror," will at once feel it a sacred *duty* to admit him to repel the accusation. They are required so to do by that law of supreme obligation, "Do unto others as ye would that they should do unto you."

The writer of these letters disclaims from the heart all feelings of hostility to the many pious and respectable individuals, some of whose religious principles may differ from his own. Difference of opinion on important religious topics ought not to break the ties

of harmony between children of the same common Parent, and subjects of the grace of the same Redeemer. On political questions men divide, who on other occasions meet on terms of friendly intercourse. And surely no Christian ought to esteem his brother his enemy because he "tells him the truth."

He is doubtful whether he ought to claim any indulgence for the imperfections of this performance, from the peculiar circumstances under which it was written. It was his wish to lay it by for frequent and careful revision. But the violence of the assault upon him seemed to require an immediate defence. He was, therefore, compelled to go rapidly on, amidst constant interruptions, amidst the calls of his usual professional duties, and often under the pressure of bodily langour. He candidly states these circumstances, because deference to the public requires that no immature or incorrect production should, if possible, be exposed to its view. But he is writing idly. The performance wields the weapon of controversy. He concludes, therefore, that it can claim no quarter. He leaves it to its fate. His chief solicitude ought to be, that its imperfections should not injure the cause which it advocates.

*New-York, June,* 1807.

## LETTER I.

Sir,

The Christian's Magazine, which the newspapers lately announced to the public, and the responsibility of which, as proprietor and editor, you take upon yourself, I have perused, and the determination is instantly formed to address you on the subject.

The tendency of the system of *denunciation* which you have adopted leaves me no alternative. This denunciation is so injurious to my character, and aims at the same time so deadly a blow at the principles of the Episcopal Church, that a moment's delay in repelling it would be traitorous to my sacred office. My soul must be palsied by cowardice, or by apathy more criminal and disgraceful than cowardice, if I could witness my writings denounced, my reputation and usefulness fundamentally assailed, and the principles of my Church held up to scorn and execration, without lifting the honest and ardent voice of remonstrance.

As editor of the Christian's Magazine, you are responsible for its contents. The editor of a miscellany may sometimes think himself compelled, by motives of delicacy or impartiality, to admit observations of which he is not the writer, and which in sentiment or in language he may deem liable to censure. To even the smallest indulgence on this plea you have renounced all claim. You assert, that "you will feel yourself not only at liberty, but under obligation to make such alterations in the pieces which may be offered for insertion, as you shall judge expedient." But this matter is well understood. For the triumphs with which taste, delicacy, and truth will doubtless crown the first number of the Christian's Magazine, you have no competitor—alone you stand *rex, magnus Apollo*. You intend to claim the honour

of having made the first breach in the towering fortress of Episcopacy. Your illustrious compeers have only to advance and raze it to the ground! All the original productions in the number of the magazine before me, with the exception of the essay on the visible Church, point with resistless evidence to you as their author. And even if I had not been long taught to expect from your appalling arm chastisement for my temerity in advocating the principles of my Church, the style and spirit of *the review of the Essays on Episcopacy* would leave me at no loss to whom to tender my most profound acknowledgments for the very honourable notice which that review has condescended to bestow on me.

I behold and address you only as *Editor* and *Reviewer*. "For your personal character I entertain unfeigned respect." We have often met, and I trust we shall often meet again, on terms of friendly intercourse. "My criticisms are intended to apply to you solely as an author." "Nor can I be justly charged with violating" my "respect" for you, "though I examine" your animadversions "with as little ceremony as" you "have brought them forward." I heartily subscribe to the noble maxim of the "imperial stoic." And in "aiming at truth, by which no man was ever injured," regardless of the dictates of a temporising policy, or of the fear or favour of man, I am swayed by the injunction of one infinitely greater than this "imperial" philosopher. "Whosoever loveth father or mother more than me" and my truth, "is not worthy of me."

Paradoxical as it may appear, I confess I am *gratified* at the appearance of the Christian's Magazine. Present calamity may be measured by the mind. Its magnitude is accurately surveyed. Its dreaded terrors diminish by the habit of contemplation; and the mind, summoning resolution, proudly surmounts them. But *threatened* calamity is often clothed with a thousand "nameless" horrors by the magnifying and exaggerating power of a panic-struck imagination. With the apprehension of a portentous calamity

I have long been tortured. My "Companion for the Altar," as innocent in its design as it is in its consequences to all the sincere inquirers after truth, had scarcely found its way among those to whom some of its principles were obnoxious, before vengeance was threatened. Prudence, however, which in charity must certainly be imputed to that *mild and tender forbearance* which knows not how to pour from its soft-flowing tongue one harsh, one unkind, one criminating expression, for near a year repressed this ire. But before the expiration of a year a "speck of war" appeared in the horizon. The prospectus of the Christian's Magazine, in the spring or summer of 1805, threatened to disturb the "relations of amity," and to engage Episcopalians and their fellow Christians in "the unprofitable contest of trying who could do one another the most harm." The opponents of Episcopacy, however, resolved to exhaust *forbearance!* The Christian's Magazine was delayed, and delayed, and delayed. Were I uncharitable, I would suspect that an aversion to enter the "bloody arena," on which Episcopacy had so often laid prostrate its antagonists, had full as much influence on this delay as the spirit of forbearance to which I feel the most cordial disposition to ascribe it. A hero, however, no less renowned than the Rev. Dr. Linn, not taught wisdom by the salutary lessons which he had received some years ago from the "Right Rev. Prelate of New-York," in a theological contest, felt all the vigour and ardour of his youthful days renewed. Indignant at this delay, and spurning the restraints of his compeers, he rushed forward to spread dismay among Episcopalians, and single-handed cover them with defeat. In his numbers styled "Miscellanies," published in the Albany Centinel, he attacked the principles of Episcopalians. He was instantly met—met, and vanquished by *striplings*, inferior to this venerable giant of literature and theology in every thing but the goodness of their cause, and judgment to defend it. Did these striplings or their friends presume ever to triumph,

that, clothed with the armour which scripture and antiquity furnished them, they had withstood the shock of the champion of Presbytery, and laid low both him and his cause? They were instantly humbled by the declarations,—The *author of Miscellanies* has been rash and indiscreet—he knows not the strength of his own cause—he has never read extensively on the subject—he did not "take the question by the proper handle"—But the Christian's Magazine! this will retrieve the laurels which have been lost—this will flash such transcendent light, that the cause of Episcopacy will not be able for a moment to bear up against its overpowering effulgence. Yes, sir, my soul has often startled at the threat, that you would rise in your might, and pouring the awful majesty of indignant truth on the rash and adventurous advocates of Episcopacy, would "chase them before you as the chaff before the wind." The thunder has at length shot from your arm. But—I yet survive! and, astonishing as it may seem, I can summon resolution to maintain my principles, and to expose your denunciations to the world. I thank you, sir—you have kindly released me from all fear of "the Christian's Magazine."

---

## LETTER II.

SIR,

WHEN I understood that a "Society of Gentlemen" had formed the resolution to expose the "fallacious reasonings" of the assertors of Episcopacy, and to defend Presbytery as the institution of Christ and his Apostles, I could not avoid cherishing the hope that a mild and dispassionate course would be pursued. I could not avoid cherishing the hope (for it was flattering to my cause and to my feelings) that, disdaining a system of denunciation, which is calculated, by awakening prejudice and passion, to prostrate reason

at the very threshold of inquiry, and thus to prejudge the cause, yourself and your coadjutors would bring the Episcopal pretensions to their only proper test, SCRIPTURE and ANTIQUITY. I did hope that you would not only acknowledge "the right of an Episcopalian to publish his peculiar sentiments," but would feel the force of the corresponding obligation, to respect, and to treat with decency and candour, the exercise of this right. From the character and professions of some of the gentlemen who were to conduct the Christian's Magazine, I did flatter myself, that, as my principles, unfounded as they might appear, were yet couched in decent language, they would be tested in the spirit of decency and candour. I did hope, that principles maintained by an host of the most eminent men that ever defended Christianity by talents, or adorned it by piety, would not, with rash and impetuous hand, be "urged over the precipice" into the gulph of infamy, till their fallacy had been "detected" by the impartial eye of dispassionate reason. My imagination sometimes deluded me with the hope, that a discussion would arise firm and manly, yet temperate and honourable; a discussion which would rescue polemic theology from the charge of that virulence which has hitherto often subjected it to merited reproach. My feelings sometimes hailed the prospect of a discussion which, releasing Christians from the disgraceful chains of prejudice and passion, and guiding them only by the mild lights of reason, scripture, and antiquity, would lead them to form just views of the ministry and ordinances of the Church, the sacred fold of salvation, very properly styled by you, "the nursery of the Church in Heaven."

But sober reflection soon dissipated these pleasing hopes. I was satisfied that the cause of the opponents of Episcopacy was weak. It had ever shrunk before the touch of dispassionate and impartial inquiry. Its advocates had seldom disdained to shield it from the wand of truth, by the weapons of low ridicule, of harsh invective, of virulent and

unfounded denunciation. I reflected too that while but *few* men *reason*, all men *feel;* that where one man follows the guidance of *reason*, thousands bow under the sceptre of *passion;* that where mild and modest *argument* lights one man to truth, bold and imposing *declamation* rivets on thousands the chains of error. The opponents of Episcopacy I knew would carry with them the resistless *spirit of the times.* Palsied by morbid indifference, this spirit I feared would not rouse itself to patient inquiry on religious topics. Throwing down the enclosures of truth, I feared it would frown on all pretensions which, however scriptural, and however reconcilable on candid construction with all the reasonable claims of charity, appeared to be *exclusive.* Impressed with these reflections, I confess I did fear that the opponents of Episcopacy would avail themselves of the weakness of human nature, and of the spirit of the times, so propitious to their cause. I did fear that prejudice and passion, seated on the throne of judgment, would be roused to condemn the cause of Episcopacy, previously even to an investigation of its merits. Investigation might fail—denunciation would be sure of success—for who would listen for a moment to these presumptuous, arrogant, and impious lords over the understanding, the consciences, the eternal destiny of men? Who could be induced even to contemplate "extravagant and arrogant pretensions"—pretensions which "unchurched, with a dash of the pen, all the non-Episcopal denominations under heaven;" which laid them under the ban of an "excommunication," "as criminal as it is dreadful!" Where the bosom so steeled to the feelings of humanity as not, in the burst of righteous indignation, to "urge over the precipice" the monsters who advanced "positions of such deep-toned horror," as might "well make the hair stand up like quills upon the fretful porcupine, and freeze the warm blood at its fountain?"*

This appeal to prejudice and passion, those tyrants of our

* This is the language in which you denounce me.

nature—this appeal, as unjust as it is ungenerous and cruel—this appeal, precluding all candid and dispassionate inquiry, even an *honest* political declaimer, in the mad fervour of party zeal, would not use without a blush. The man of letters, the Christian, the divine should frown it from him with righteous disdain. You, sir, have condescended to enlist it in your cause. Examine the review of the Essays on Episcopacy. Every sentence rests for triumph on the success of its appeal to the prejudices and passions of the reader. Urge not, in extenuation, that effervescence of indignation which, at the first view of obnoxious opinions, may overpower the cool judgment, the mild charities of even the honest and amiable heart. More than two years have elapsed since these obnoxious opinions must have first met your eye. During this period the plan of the Christian's Magazine has been arranging, materials collecting, and the matter preparing that was to enrich its pages. There has been full time for chastening the indignant and passionate review of *the Essays on Episcopacy*, by the gentle dictates of judgment and charity. The intemperate spirit which it breathes is left without even the excuse of precipitancy and rashness.

Your endeavour to enlist the prejudices and passions of Christians to condemn, without an impartial hearing, the cause of Episcopacy, may obtain a triumph; but it is a triumph which I shall not contest with you. It is a triumph, the full honours of which I shall not seek to wrest from your brow. Yes, sir, you may succeed in inducing non-Episcopalians to reject a candid examination of opinions on which you have fixed the seal of blasphemy, impiety and horror. You may even rouse those Episcopalians who are "ignorant of the foundation and reasons of that church order to which they adhere," and who, "when any thing is done which, though strictly proper, does not coincide with their convenience or their habits, are both startled and displeased;" you may rouse those Episcopalians who "have thrown the

reins on the neck of their charity," "who are carried away by the current of a spurious liberality;"* you may rouse them to join with you in sinking under the charges of rashness, imprudence, and illiberal zeal, those guardians of the Church who presume to discharge their solemn vows of ordination;—to "drive away from the fold those erroneous and strange doctrines" concerning the constitution and ministry of the Church, which, within these late ages, have rent her into numberless schisms. Be it so. They who summon courage to attack the monster error in the den where he has long reposed, must not expect him to yield without a struggle, nor until he has exhausted upon them the venom and fire of his rage. But the sceptre of truth, wielded by patient and persevering courage, will at length paralize his efforts, and lay him prostrate. If non-Episcopalians have any regard to the sacred claims of truth and justice, they will indignantly spurn every attempt to enlist their prejudices and passions against opinions which it is their solemn duty seriously and dispassionately to examine. As men of candour and justice, who consider their judgment and conscience as their guides; as honest inquirers after truth; as Christians who are to answer at the dread tribunal of God, whether they have earnestly and honestly sought to subdue prejudice and passion, I trust they will feel it their sacred duty to disregard your denunciations, to read and judge for themselves."† Episcopalians, I trust, will all soon be ashamed of that timid and false liberality which, by concealing the distinctive principles of their Church, is levelling the barriers with which

* I mark as quotations your own language.

† Every principle of candour and justice loudly calls on them to peruse the Collection of Essays on the subject of Episcopacy. To form a judgment on this important subject from the partial representations of the Christian's Magazine would be treason against truth and conscience, The advocates of Episcopacy demand only candid inquiry, impartial investigation. Let it be remembered, the Collection of Essays on the subject of Episcopacy contains not only the arguments in favour of it, but those of the Rev. Dr Linn against it.

the sacred wisdom of ages hath fenced her round; and laying open that celestial "vine which the right hand of the Lord hath planted," to the destructive assaults of heresy and schism, "to be rooted up by the boar out of the wood, and devoured by the wild beast of the forest."

My own determination is unalterably formed—in that firm language which conscious truth inspires, but in "that meekness of celestial wisdom" which the gospel enjoins, to defend the Apostolic Church, at whose altar I minister, against "every weapon that is formed against her"—to maintain that sacred institution of Episcopacy, which, committed to the Church by her divine Head, no unhallowed hand for fifteen centuries dared to touch; which has been the sacred channel through which the ministerial commission has flowed from him who is "the Head and Saviour of the body," to whom "all power is given in heaven and in earth." I shall respect, I have always respected, the conscientious opinions of others. I shall resist the arm of violence, whether lifted up against their religious rights or my own. I shall not denounce, I have never denounced, the honest inquirers after truth, by whatever name distinguished. No difference of opinion, no ire of controversy shall lead me to cut asunder the sacred ties of friendship; shall ever prevent me from regarding, with sincere affection, every one who bears the holy impress of Jesus as the subject of his mercy and grace. But while mindful of my own infirmity and liability to error, I presume not to wield the thunders of that tribunal where I must myself, through my Saviour's intercession, plead for mercy, I shall discharge the sacred duty of maintaining and enforcing that order of the Church which, it is my conscientious conviction, bears the seal of divine authority. As "a messenger, a watchman, and steward of the Lord," bearing on my soul the solemn obligation "to teach and to premonish, to feed and to provide for the Lord's family," I shall not "cease my labour, my care and diligence,"* in warning the

* Ordination service.

members of Christ's fold of the guilt and danger of schism, of separating from that "priesthood who derive their authority by regular transmission from Christ, the divine Head of the Church, and the source of all power in it."* This exercise of a common right, even in the most unexceptionable mode, in addresses to persons of the Episcopal communion (and this is the mode in which I originally exercised it,) this discharge of a sacred duty may subject me to odium and denunciation. The destiny still more to be deprecated may await me, of being "wounded" (where I ought to find encouragement and support) "in the house of my friends." I shall still have the consolation of having faithfully borne my testimony to the principles of the Apostolic and primitive Church; to principles which "the noble army of martyrs" confessed in their writings, in their lives, in the agonies of those cruel deaths to which their persecutors hunted them; to principles which in every age have ranked among their advocates some of the brightest ornaments of science, and intrepid champions of divine truth. I shall still have the consolation of having defended the cause of Episcopacy, with inferior strength indeed, but with equal zeal, in the same ranks with the "incomparable HOOKER," the eminent and revered Bishops HALL, ANDREWS, SANDERSON, TAYLOR, BEVERIDGE, POTTER, WAKE, WILSON, HORNE, HORSELEY; the learned and pious divines CHILLINGWORTH, HAMMOND, LESLIE, JONES; and "a legion more," illustrious for talents, for learning and piety. I shall still have the consolation of having "studied to approve myself" unto my divine Master as "a workman rightly dividing the word of truth." These are consolations with which "no stranger intermeddleth," which even the rude hand of violence cannot disturb. The system of *denunciation* which you pursue is calculated to awaken a persecution more poignant to the feeling mind than even the flame and sword that torture the body. I have no hesitation to say that I deprecate it; and I must pray, there-

* Preface to the *Companion for the Altar*.

fore, that neither my faith be shaken, my resolution weakened, nor my charity extinguished. I must pray that, amidst the denunciation of foes and the desertion of friends, my soul may be raised in holy hope above this misjudging world; may soar on vigorous wing to that celestial scene where the mists of error shall be dissipated by the radiant beams of truth, and its faithful and honest advocates find a refuge from the scorn of the world in the eternal plaudits of their Redeemer and Judge.

---

## LETTER III

SIR,

THE Christian's Magazine comes forth in a proud and imposing attitude, demanding instant submission to its authoritative decrees; and, in the spirit which inflames every sentence, denouncing immolation on the altar of its wrath, against all who shall refuse to bend the knee to its dogmas. Little disposed to yield my understanding or my conscience to the keeping of any man, whatever may be his talents, his learning, or his worth, you must excuse me if I refuse to pay divine honours to this idol of party, or to submit without resistance to its unjust denunciations. Marked indeed it is with all that bitterness of controversy, and justifying to the full extent that high spirit of polemic warfare, to chastise which, I have supposed, was to constitute one of its proudest triumphs. The sin which marked my conscience with a stain black as midnight darkness, and for which I have been pursued with indignant invective, is, that I scattered the firebrands of discord through the peaceful seats of Zion. The sin for which the charge of "illiberal bigot" has flashed on my devoted head from a thousand tongues, is, that I arrogantly denounced all denominations but my own. To crush this baneful fiend of controversy, the parent of "endless

strife and every evil work;" to cover with confusion the arrogant upstarts who hurled the bolts of denunciation through the Lord's heritage, the Christian's Magazine was to rear its arm, formidable with the concentered genius, talents, and learning of a constellation of divines. When, lo! we are assailed not by a firm, yet temperate, a decided, yet decent defence of divine truth and exposure of error, but by a system of intemperate denunciation. Come, sir, I put this matter "upon the trial before the bar of public criticism." I must insist on your accompanying me through the pages of your magazine. A tour through the majestic forest which owes its vigorous foliage, its towering strength to your nervous cultivation, must surely raise in your bosom the emotions of exultation, whatever may be the effect of the survey on my feelings or those of the public.

I assert, sir, that your magazine presents not *a firm, yet temperate, a decided, yet decent defence of divine truth and exposure of error, but an unrelenting system of intemperate* DENUNCIATION. Let us open your introduction. The different sects and parties of Christians present themselves before you. "Some," you say, "excluding the light of understanding, place their religion in fervour of feeling." Here your battery first opens on the sect of enthusiasts. We are accustomed to consider the *Methodists* as distinguished for placing their religion in fervour of feeling. "Some clamour incessantly for doctrine, as if the heart had nothing to do in the service of God, or as if practical holiness were a necessary fruit of speculative orthodoxy." Here I must acquit you of all design of denouncing Episcopalians; for you know they are charged with undervaluing *doctrinal preaching*. But if they escape here, it is evidently your intention in the next sentence to make them smart under the lash; for you observe—"Some, like the self-justifiers of old, 'tithe mint and anise and cummin'—little concerned about 'either receiving the Lord Jesus, or walking in him,' provided they be exact in their routine of ceremonies." From the Episcopalians you

turn your wrathful frown to a sect in this city, I believe, of Baptists, who contend that they are *consistent Calvinists*. They maintain that as, according to the Calvinistic system, Christ is the Redeemer of the elect only, as he shed his blood for them alone, and will in due time convert them by his irresistible grace, they who are not thus converted, and are therefore not of the number of the elect, have no concern in the offers of salvation. And as, according to the Calvinistic system, the elect are justified by the *unconditional* imputation of Christ's righteousness, it is absurd, they contend, to maintain that the elect are subject to any law of works; since this would be making their salvation conditional, would be derogating from the all-sufficiency of the righteousness of Christ, and from the glory of God's free and sovereign grace. These persons, who maintain that they are consistent Calvinists, you accuse of "poisoning the Gospel at the fountain head"—of "annihilating the authority of God with the same blow which fells the hope of the sinner." High Churchmen, nearly crushed by your first blow, are now laid prostrate. For you accuse them of laying "as much stress upon their external order, as if the key which opens the door of their communion opened, at the same moment, the doors of Paradise; although," you continue to remark, "upon that supposition, it is evident that the 'gate' and 'way' which 'lead unto life' are no longer straight and narrow." Tremendous denunciation! for if the "gate" and "way" of high Churchmen be not that "straight gate and narrow way" which "lead unto life," they must be the "wide gate and broad way" which "lead to destruction!" *Low Churchmen* next sink beneath your ire. Because *they* "account the external order of the house of God a matter of no importance," you charge them with "countenancing, at least indirectly, violation of their Lord's commandment, invasion of his prerogative, and assault upon his truth." "And as although all this were not enough," as if the triumphs gained over these prostrate sects could not satisfy you, you scorn not to erect an-

other trophy on the neck of the humble Methodist and harmless Quaker. As they endeavour "to set aside the distinctive character, and the authentic call of the gospel ministry," you accuse them of a deadly blow at Christianity itself, of "laying the axe at the root of entire Christianity." And the instruments which they so honourably employ in this detestable service, and by which they draw many after "their pernicious ways," are "the avarice of one class, the conceit of another, the credulity of a third, and the ignorance of all!" "A jealousy for the glory of *divine teaching*," their "avowed" motive for "proscribing from the ministry all learning, taste, and talents," is only a "*mask*;" and "it will be well," you observe, "if the mask shall be found to have concealed the tendency of their principles from their own view;" that is, it will be well if they should not be found designing hypocrites, who are wilfully "laying the axe at the root of entire Christianity!" Now, if all this be not an *unrelenting system of violent and unqualified denunciation*, I suppose I must acknowledge myself guilty of having wilfully converted "the gentle dews of instruction and consolation to friends," into "thunderbolts hurled at the heads of opponents."

There is scarcely a page of your magazine which does not palpably violate those judicious rules for the conducting of religious discussion which you profess to take as your guide. Even the essay "on religious controversy," the *design* of which I certainly commend, and which more than justifies me in all my publications, breathes a spirit as relentless against all who even doubt the policy or utility of religious controversy, as ever disgraced the most violent polemic. Hitherto theological combatants have persecuted each other. You summon them to shake hands, and to turn wrathfully upon those who, as mediators, would persuade them to lay down the weapons of theological warfare. One would have thought that this essay at least should have exhibited a specimen of that cool, that decorous manner, that charitable allowance for human prejudice and passion (which enthral,

alas! the best of men) by which controversy might be made to subserve the holy interests of truth. No; the "pretence that religion is a concern too solemn and sacred for the passions of controversy," you pronounce not only an "error" (which every considerate person will acknowledge,) but an "error *without excuse*," like the profane "pretence with which some justify their restraining prayer before God."* Nay, "no medium can be assigned between receiving and rejecting the truth. If rejected, we seal our perdition"†—*Involuntary error* is no palliation—perdition is the certain doom! And yet the Christian's Magazine was to chastise my arrogant and uncharitable pretensions!

In your essay on "liberality in religion," the *liberal Christian* is "pursued, hunted, and urged over the precipice"‡ with an overbearing and intemperate violence, which must tend to divert from him that sentence of just censure which sober reason would otherwise pronounce on him. This spurious liberality, injurious as it certainly is to the cause of truth, proceeds not always from a culpable indifference, but frequently from an excessive mildness of disposition, and from an abuse of that charity which "hopeth all things." It might surely, therefore, claim some little commiseration, especially from the ministers of him who "is not strict to mark what," through unavoidable infirmity, "may be done amiss." But no, sir, your inexorable voice seals, without hope of mercy, its doom. "They who enlist under the banner of the prevailing liberality"—they who even "profess their *charity*" not for certain "detestable" heretical "*opinions*," but only for *those who hold them!*"—they who do not, therefore, with papal intolerance, sweep into irremediable perdition every heretic, "are leagued in a conspiracy against the glorious gospel" of the "great God our

* Christian's Magazine, p. 21, 22.

† Christian's Magazine, p. 20.

‡ I have often occasion to use your language.

Saviour!"* Gracious Jehovah! is it then for a worm of the dust, who derives all his hopes from thy unmerited mercy, to wrest from thee thy thunder, and wield it against his fellow worms! Thou, gracious Father of our spirits! is it then for us to pronounce that there are in our fallen nature no infirmities,—in this evil world no unavoidable sources of prejudice, which can possibly render even *fundamental* error *venial* in thy sight, and wash it away in that blood which was shed for "the sins of the world?" Or is it not enough that he who errs through *involuntary* and *unavoidable weakness*, will be condemned at thy sovereign tribunal; but must his doom be anticipated by the lips of those who should pity and pray for him?

Deplorable indeed, in its fairest colours, is the present state of the Christian Church. But your pencil seems to delight to deepen its shades. Not a ray of light shoots through the tremendous gloom. "Gross ignorance of the gospel thickens apace in a clime that is illuminated by its broadest sunshine. The barriers which ought to divide the Church from the world are swept away, and every trait of discrimination effaced." "In a land of Bibles, which cannot be opened without the lightning of God's reprobation of their folly flashing in their faces, miserable sinners, unjustified, unwashed, unsanctified, are praising each other's Christianity!" And to dash from the picture every ray of consolation, "the delusion is often fostered by the *very men* whose office should impel them to counteract and destroy it!"†

That a spirit of denunciation so severe on bodies and communities should not relax its harsh features when individuals encounter its criticism, was certainly to be expected. That I should be made to "drink of the dregs of the cup" of your displeasure has long been threatened. And I shall soon have occasion to show, that the vials of your wrath have been emptied upon me. Even Mr. M'Leod, your friend

* Christian's Magazine, p. 36.

† Christian's Magazine, p. 36, 37.

and coadjutor, sometimes trembles before your chair of censorship. But Mr. M'Leod had written a good Presbyterian catechism. Mr. M'Leod is a good Calvinist. He is not, therefore, to be too harshly handled. The aged censor accordingly relaxes the rigid frown, and, patting him on the cheek, as if he were a school-boy exhibiting the first hard-drawn efforts of invention, brightens up his sorrowful countenance by the kind assurance, that the many imperfections of his style "will wear away by the liberal use of his pen!"*

No less a personage than the Rev. Dr. Nott, the President of Union College, is summoned to pass your rigorous ordeal. Liable as the charge of the Rev. President may be in many respects to the censure of a just and correct taste, you "detect, pursue, hunt, and urge over the precipice" its errors with an overbearing and impetuous spirit, which is as injurious to his public character as it is revolting to taste, truth and feeling. Qualified by no real commendation, and softened by no delicacy, the denunciations issue from your high tribunal, that Dr. Nott's imagination is "unequal, erratic, and uncontrolled by the laws of correct criticism." In the style of his charge "we look in vain for that precision, that strength, that chastened and firm and commanding dignity which befitted the occasion." You wrest figures from their proper place and connection, where alone a correct judgment is to be formed on their justness and propriety, and exhibit

* In your note at page 107, you aim a side blow at the learned Drs. Mitchill and Miller, the Editors of the "Medical Repository." These gentlemen had presumed, without consulting you, to speak in terms of some commendation of "Dufief's Nature Displayed," &c. This book, like "Mr. Marshall's Life," you very concisely consign to the "cook-maid and the vender of snuff," by branding it as "vapouring folly;" and then remark, "that people who are unacquainted with the science of language should be duped, is nothing strange; but that the deception should be upheld by names which ought to be sacred to the patronage of *sound* literature, is both surprising and humiliating!!" Nay, sir, the President of the United States, and the learned President of Princeton College, and other literary characters who recommended Dufief's work, are branded as giving their sanction to "vapouring folly."

them in immediate contrast to ridicule and scorn. In the parting charge of a President of a college to his students, limited as it necessarily must be, and deriving no small portion of its interest from its being supposed to flow in some measure spontaneously from the heart, no one can reasonably expect the arrangement and developement of a laboured and systematic discourse. But because in this single charge the extensive sphere of instruction is not exhausted, and every subject enforced which can be interesting to the studies, the pursuits, and the happiness of youth, the charge is denounced as "throwing out" merely "useful hints," "without which it would be absolutely worthless!" Nay, Dr. Nott has "led his pupils along the confines of the infected region," which nourished "old Celsus," and still fattens "Thomas Paine." Tell me not that he has done this "undesignedly;" this aggravates "crime," by the guilt of inexcusable ignorance. What! a respectable Divine, whose business it is to attack and conquer the strong holds of infidelity—a President of a college, awfully responsible for the moral principles of those whose minds he cultures, and yet "undesignedly leads them along the confines of that infected region" which taints with the pollution of death! Nay, sir, you assert that "every thing which Dr. Nott has said might be said by a sober deist!" "It is only blank *atheism* which Dr. N. rebukes!" A minister devoted by the most solemn vows to the cross of Christ, and yet in effect denying him—what can he be but a perjured hypocrite! If your denunciations be well founded, would not Dr. Nott's pupils be justified in wresting from his chair the monster who, under the smiles of affectionate solicitude, is secretly infusing into their souls the poison that will pollute and blast them for ever? And what authorizes these tremendous denunciations—denunciations against a minister of the gospel, who, if general report can be relied on (for you, sir, are silent on this point,) is not more beloved for his amiable temper, than respected and admired for the *evangelical* ardour of his public ministrations? What, I say, has occasioned

these tremendous denunciations? Dr. Nott "placed the character of Jesus Christ before his pupils as the *perfect model*, in the imitation of which would consist their happiness and glory"—and did not think it necessary to obtrude upon his pupils on a *literary* occasion, a *sermon*—such a sermon as would be able to stand the ordeal of the Pastor of the first Associate Reformed Church in the city of New-York! But I forbear; Dr. Nott, if he deem it necessary, can vindicate himself; my design in these remarks has simply been to establish my general position, that your magazine presents not *a firm, yet temperate, a decided, yet decent defence of divine truth and exposure of error, but an unrelenting system of intemperate denunciation.*

---

## LETTER IV.

SIR,

FROM the review which I took in my last letter of your magazine, I think I am authorized to say, that I look in vain through its pages for that delicacy of feeling, that refinement of taste, that modest recollection of human infirmity, that tender regard for the character and feelings of others, which are strictly compatible with the sternest devotion to the cause of truth, and which make us feel the justice while they soothe the severity of criticism. The radiance of mercy which invites sinful mortals to the throne of the Eternal, and which even their crimson sins could not extinguish, is banished from the stern seat of judgment in which you are enthroned. Bolt succeeding bolt is hurled on the hapless culprit, and down he sinks the victim of execration and scorn.

Writers whose intentions, whatever may be their errors, are evidently honest, have a claim upon the public for decency and civility of treatment. *Authoritative* judgment upon their writings belongs to the public alone. And when

any individual, self-elevated to the throne of criticism, imperiously deals around him the arbitrary sentence of condemnation, mollified neither by politeness of manner, nor by delicacy and refinement of style, the public I conceive are insulted in this violent and unjust exercise of their prerogative.

Perhaps you claim from your office as reviewer a right to pursue this system of denunciation. But does your elevation to the chair of criticism throw at your feet every writer who presumes to address the public, and authorize you to denounce his errors and imperfections, as if they were sins that should consign him to eternal infamy? It is the tendency of literature to polish the taste; to soften the asperities of our nature; and to substitute the language of cultivated and polished gentlemen for the boorish, but, no doubt, frequently *nervous* language of the vulgar. But the style of your critical remarks is calculated to change the hall of the Lyceum into the arena of the Amphitheatre, and the dignity and decorum which should characterise the discussion of truth into the virulence and animosity which disgrace even personal combats.

Are we to admit as an excuse for this bold and imperious denunciation, your zeal for God and his holy truth? And is it thus, sir, our blessed Master has taught us to "contend earnestly for the faith?" In "detecting," in "pursuing," in "hunting error," has he commanded us to "urge it over the precipice," regardless of the dictates of that charity which "hopeth all things, believeth all things, is not puffed up, and vaunteth not itself?" Is our ardent zeal to rush on its desolating career, contemning that celestial "wisdom" which is "gentle, easy to be intreated, and full of mercy?"

Can a system of intemperate denunciation find an apology in the strength and ardour of genius? There is, indeed, a *glow of soul* which lights on truth with almost intuitive keenness; which seizes it with impetuous ardour; and bears it forward to victory, unappalled by obstacles, quickened to

higher intrepidity by dangers and defeats. This glow of soul, this *vis fervida mentis*, towering above the pusillanimous efforts of weak and inferior minds, commands my homage. It is the illustrious mark of exalted genius—it is the lofty attendant of the noble spirit—it is the spring of whatever is great in thought, of whatever is magnanimous in action. When it is controlled by correct judgment; when it is chastened by polished taste; when the divine spirit of Christian charity mitigates its boldness and impetuosity, it shines like the lustre of the *sun-beam;* carrying the light of conviction to the bosom of error, through the deep folds in which she has enwrapped herself; and shedding, on the mild form of truth, celestial and resistless charms. But when this ardour of soul contemns the guidance of judgment, disdains the polish of taste, and frowns on the suggestions of Christian charity, how appalling and devastating its course! Raging like the "northern blast," the charms of intellectual nature are withered; delicacy, sentiment, taste and feeling, bound in icy chains; and all the mild and tender charities of the heart swept as with the "besom" of death.

Sir, I cannot avoid suggesting to you—(pardon my presumption)—whether, with all your profound attainments, you have yet acquired that essential constituent in a *great* and *useful character*, a knowledge of human nature. Had the human heart been laid open before you, you would have found that *pride* is its governing principle; and that a sentiment of just and honest pride revolts against oppression, whether the despot lay his yoke on the body or the mind. He whose understanding is perverted by error must be treated with mildness, with decency, with respect; or you fix him irreclaimably in his errors—you rouse him to vigorous resistance. *Persecute* error, and you surround it with an host of friends, who will throw their shields before it, and dare your assaults. Had you known, or regarded this palpable fact in the history of human nature, you would not have attempted, by lofty denunciation and virulent declamation, to

compel the judgments and consciences of men to bow implicitly to your dogmas. The iron sceptre which you have wielded against the sacred sanctuary of the mind, would have crumbled from your hand, or fastened its wrath only on the incorrigibly wicked. You would have sought from your divine Master the "rod" of celestial wisdom. By its mild and powerful sway, you would have sought to reclaim from the paths of error the unhappy wanderer, and gently to lead him, pouring forth blessings on his compassionate Shepherd, beside the peaceful "waters" of truth and salvation.

It would be arrogance in me to expect that you should feel the justice of the preceding strictures. I can assure you they are not congenial with my taste or feelings. Had the Christian's Magazine come forward to discuss dispassionately and respectfully the important topics of literature and taste; to institute a fair, candid, and respectful comparison between the "conflicting claims" of theological opinions; to throw the light of truth on the dark retreats of error, by perspicuous and forcible, yet temperate and decorous argument, I should have respected its claims; I should have hailed it as a fair candidate for public support. What I might have deemed its errors, if temperately maintained; what I might have deemed its false criticisms on my writings, if decently urged, I should have delighted, I should have been emulous to meet with equal temper and decency. In a contest where only the love of truth sways the bosom, and politeness, taste, and candour wield the weapons of warfare, I should be proud in being ranked as a combatant, nor should I deem it dishonourable to bow to a victor. But, judging from the first number of the Christian's Magazine, what is its design? Evidently to pronounce decrees concerning every topic of taste, literature and religion with oracular confidence; and to "pursue" and "hunt" dissent from its dogmas as an offence deep as that of questioning holy writ. Renouncing fair, candid, temperate inquiry, it disdains not to torture opinions into the most detestable consequences, and

then to hold up those who maintain them to execration and scorn;—closing its pages against the language of defence and remonstrance. What, sir, is evidently the design of its editor—a design in the success of which some of his friends are already triumphing? Not merely to browbeat and intimidate the advocates of Episcopacy, but to denounce all who question the infallibility of his standard of taste and criticism; all who shall presume to shake off, as equally unreasonable and unscriptural, the *peculiarities* of Calvinism; when it is apparent that these are the designs of the magazine and its editor, I take the liberty of inquiring what claims have they to forbearance or indulgence? When the sacred rights of judgment, of conscience, of free inquiry are violated, can tame submission consist either with independence or virtue? When in the republic of literature, a dictator usurps the throne, are we to cast down the spear and shield, and kiss the rod? When in the sacred concerns of religion, a divine injunction binds it on the conscience to "call no man master on earth," can it weaken the solemn duty of resistance that the bull of infallibility issues, not from the Pope of Rome, but from the Pastor of an Associate-Reformed Church? If, therefore, you should attempt to ride over the necks of your own people; if you should aim at compelling the very complaisant Clergy who bear with you the common name of Presbyterian, implicitly to obey all your caprices and decrees,* it is no concern of mine. But when you claim despotic authority over me, there is a spirit within me which instantly says, No. And though the powers of my mind may not rise equal to the proud independence of my heart, that heart resolutely determines to shake off the yoke of a dictator—One is its Lord and master, even Christ, and it will not "bow the knee to Baal." You leave me no alternative. I must either turn and resolutely stem the flood

* It seems they have transferred the magazine to you as editor and proprietor, and from the sentence you pronounce on their communications there is no appeal.

of denunciation, or sink beneath its surges. When the gentle breeze fans the plain, the humble lily of the valley may rest secure in its lowliness and simplicity. But when winds and tempests bear along the raging torrent, even the venerable oak of the forest, whose roots sinking deep for ages have seized the foundations of the earth, finds its safety only in bearing up unyielding to the blast. Happy may I esteem myself if I can summon strength and resolution to conflict with the storm whose black clouds have long rolled, and at length emptied upon me the floods of wrath.

If any persons are not satisfied, from the view already taken of your magazine, that it calculates for success on confident assertion, bold declamation, and virulent denunciation, let them candidly consider your "review of the Collection of Essays on Episcopacy." There, qualified only by one single expression of "unfeigned respect" for "personal character," the advocates of Episcopacy, among whom I am honoured with a conspicuous place, are held up to public view in colours that must effectually destroy all their claims to respect and even to toleration. They are represented as advancing "extravagant," "offensive" and "arrogant" "pretensions;"* as "hurling thunderbolts at the heads of opponents;"† as involving non-Episcopalians *indiscriminately* in the charges of being "schismatics, usurpers, rebels;"‡ as charging, in effect, "all clergymen not Episcopally ordained with being impostors, their commissions forgeries, and their sacraments blasphemy;"§ as repeating "aspersions" which "violate all the rules of prudence and charity;"‖ as asserting that all "non-Episcopalians" are "children of wrath," whose religion is "marred and rendered stark naught" by "separation from the Episcopal priesthood,"¶ and softening this "sweeping sentence of proscription" by a "relief not worth accepting"** as imposing the awful "alternative, EPISCOPACY OF PERDITION!!"†† as pronouncing

* Christian's Magazine, p. 87 and 104. † p. 90. ‡ p. 90.
§ p. 92. ‖ p. 92. ¶ p. 94. ** p. 94. †† p. 95.

"upon millions of the dead and living" an excommunication as criminal as it is dreadful;* as deliberately holding "positions of such deep-toned horror as may well make the hair stand up 'like quills upon the fretful porcupine,' and 'freeze the warm blood at its fountain;"† as having "done much towards misleading men's minds as to the foundation of eternal hope;"‡ as guilty of the horrible blasphemy of "placing the external order of the Church upon a level with the merits of the Lord Jesus," and of holding opinions which make all "non-Episcopalians, of necessity, infidels;"§ as "virtually delivering unto Satan hundreds of churches"|| pure in doctrine, discipline, worship, resplendent in piety and godliness, while comparatively the church which they advocate and its ministers are deficient in "evangelical preaching," regardless of "pure communion," negligent in feeding "the sheep of Christ and his lambs with the bread of God," attracting the "thoughtless gay," but holding out little to "allure those who become seriously concerned about their eternal salvation"—"Verily" if this is not a denunciation of the Episcopal Church and her advocates, calculated to consign them to indignation and scorn—if this is not a *violent denunciation* of Episcopalians, "it is so like one, that we need a shrewd interpreter at our elbow to prevent our mistaking it. 'I never,' said Jack of Lord Peter's brown bread, 'saw a piece of mutton in my life so nearly resembling a twelve-penny loaf!!'"¶ And this denunciation is hurled against us,

* p. 96 and 97. † Christian's Magazine, p. 96.
‡ p. 98. § p. 99, 100. || p. 102.

¶ I am indebted for this apt retort to you, and you to Swift's Tale of a Tub. You quote as authority this celebrated satire. I shall certainly be excusable in quoting it after you. What think you of the following, taken from that part of the "Tale of a Tub" where Martin and Jack are represented as stripping their *coats* (their respective churches) of the superfluous ornaments with which Lord Peter had decorated them. "*Zeal* is never so highly obliged as when you set it a *tearing;* and *Jack,* who doated on this quality in himself, allowed it its full swing. Thus it happened, that stripping down a parcel of *gold lace* a little too hastily, he rent the *main body* of his *coat* from top to bottom; and, whereas his

though we disclaim repeatedly and solemnly all the deductions upon which it is founded, and hold them in utter detestation. Let the reader reflect on this conduct, and then turn to the introduction of your magazine—"No abuse nor *virulence* shall pollute its pages."* Let him turn to the conclusion of the essay "on Religious Controversy"—"No consequence of an opinion should be attributed to those by whom it is disowned."† And then let him turn to "his account current with human imperfection."‡

What, sir, let me seriously ask you, would you think of this system of denunciation were it aimed against yourself? What would you think of a man who, while he would not "dispute your right to publish your peculiar sentiments,"§ should knock you down the first word you uttered? In what light would you regard a religious instructor who, while he enforced the duty of "contending earnestly for the faith," should argue and write as if it were utterly impossible that the faith could exist but in the dogmas of his own bosom? What would you think of a writer whose publications should breathe in every page the language, "I am the man, and wisdom shall die with me!" What would you think of a religious zealot who, with one hand, should smite that idol of modern worship, "liberality of opinion," and,

talent was not of the happiest in *taking up a stitch*, he knew no better way than to darn it again with *pack-thread* and a *skewer*. But the matter was yet infinitely worse (I record it with tears) when he proceeded to the *embroidery:* For being *clumsy by nature*, and of temper *impatient;* withal, beholding millions of stitches that required the nicest hand, and sedatest constitution to extricate, in a great rage he tore off the whole piece, cloth and all, and flung it into the kennel, and furiously thus continued his career:—"Ah! good brother *Martin*," said he, "do "as I do, for the love of God; strip, tear, pull, rend, flay off all, that we "may appear as unlike the rogue *Peter* as it is possible; I would not for "an hundred pounds carry the least mark about me that might give "occasion to the neighbours of suspecting that I was related to such a "rascal!"

* Christian's Magazine, p. 14. † p. 25. ‡ See concluding sentence of Essay on "Religious Controversy," p. 26. § p. 93.

with the other, should seize the throne of "the Vicar of Christ;" who, thundering bull after bull from the Vatican, should require every person, without appealing to his senses or understanding, instantly to receive their decrees, or be stretched on the rack of inquisitorial despotism?* Pardon me, sir, your enforcing with firmness and decency your own opinions, your attacking with plainness and warmth obnoxious errors, constitute no just ground of crimination. It is your attempt, by a system of violent denunciation, to excite against me the prejudices and passions of your readers, which imperiously demands the most pointed resistance. Your candid criticisms I do not fear. Your temperate reasonings I do not deprecate. I contest not your right even to "detect," "hunt," and "pursue" my "errors;"—only let reason and candour, not prejudice and passion, be my pursuers. "Urge me not over the precipice" until dispassionate and charitable judgment has decided that my opinions, with all their qualifications, are "extravagant," "arrogant," and of "deep-toned horror." But you do not inquire into the abstract truth or falsehood of my opinions; you torture them to extreme consequences, as *unjust* as they are repugnant to my assertions and feelings. It is your determination to "leave me no shelter from crime but the thickets of contradiction;"—a contradiction not on some topics of taste, literature, or polities, but on the infinitely momentous concerns of eternity: a contradiction, therefore, which, considering my responsibility as a guide of the souls of men, holds me up to more than scorn and contempt. This conduct constitutes the ground of my complaining. Against this I protest. I have a right to resist it, and the dearest principles of self-defence justify the exercise of this right.

* Your quere may be easily answered—"How many bow-shots is such a writer off from the territory of our sovereign lord the Pope?" He did not wait for the hat of a Cardinal, but with one leap mounted the papal chair—"We ne'er shall look upon his like again."

## LETTER V.

SIR,

I SHALL now more particularly take up your "review of the Essays on Episcopacy." I pledge myself to prove that it is one continued strain of confident assertion, intemperate declamation, and uncandid views of my opinions. I pledge myself to make every weapon which you have aimed against me recoil upon yourself.

Your illustrious predecessor, the author of "Miscellanies," had taken no small pains to fix on me the odium of having made a violent and unprovoked attack upon non-Episcopalians. This charge exactly suited your plan of denunciation. It would enable you to rouse, at the very "threshold," the prejudices and passions of your readers. The work you purposed to review would be condemned before one *argument* had been offered to expose its fallacy. It would have been requiring too much of you, therefore, to disdain to dress up in more glaring colours the unfounded aspersion, that I was a wanton and unprovoked aggressor. The author of Miscellanies was immediately met by my friend the "Layman." In his third and fourth number* this gentleman defended these publications from the charge of aggression. He proved that they only contained what the writer deemed the principles of the Episcopal Church, stated in an unexceptionable style—that this statement of their peculiar opinions was a right exercised by all denominations, and never before considered as a just cause of offence—that the consequences of these opinions, unavoidably affecting other denominations, were qualified by every allowance for the erroneous conclusions of the sincere and honest inquirers after truth which the most unbounded charity could demand. The unjust charge of aggression was thus refuted and exposed. The weapon which the author of Miscellanies aimed against me dropt

* Collection of Essays on Episcopacy, p. 30, &c and 40, &c.

from his arm. In the burst of mortified indignation you have rushed forward, and condescended to take it up. Wielded by you, it comes winged with destruction. You quote obnoxious passages.* You turn them over and over. You sift them till nothing is left but some hard names. These you represent me as ungraciously dealing against non-Episcopalians. Your triumph seems now almost complete; and a keen stroke of satire lays me prostrate at your feet. But "I cry you mercy"—I have had a little time to breathe—And humbly beg you to permit me, by a simple story, to defend myself. It pains me to be compelled by your denunciations, to occupy so much of these letters with personal remarks.

My opinions on the subject of Episcopacy cannot be ranked among the prejudices of education. I bless God that I was baptized, in infancy, in the Episcopal Church. That part of my life, however, during which my religious principles became a subject of my anxious investigation, was passed at a Presbyterian college. Respect and veneration for my instructors and guides in the paths of science—esteem and affection for many valued friends, to whom I knew certain opinions on the subject of Episcopacy would be obnoxious, excited in my bosom a painful struggle between the most amiable impulses of feeling and the strong demands of duty. But when after as honest and faithful examination as I was able to make, I became fully satisfied that it was "evident from scripture and ancient authors, that there have been from the Apostles' times three orders of ministers, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons in Christ's Church;" and that the Episcopal Church considered no man as "a *lawful* Bishop, Priest, or Deacon who hath not had Episcopal consecration or ordination,"† it surely became my duty to maintain and inculcate what the Church had thus solemnly declared. Perhaps also I had cause to apprehend that Episcopalians in many places

* Christian's Magazine, p. 90.

† Preface to the Ordination Services.

were losing sight of these important truths; that many of them made no distinction as to authority between ministers Episcopally ordained, whom the Episcopal Church considers as alone "lawful ministers," and those who had not received Episcopal ordination; and through the want of correct information I myself had been led, in some cases, to violate the principles of my church. It surely cannot, therefore, be a matter of surprise that I should feel a solicitude to arrest, by my efforts, however humble, the progress of an indifference and laxity of opinion which threatened destruction to the distinctive principles of the Episcopal Church. Had I been disposed to invite controversy, I would have advocated and enforced Episcopacy in books inviting general perusal. Had I been disposed to attack non-Episcopalians, I would have made a pointed address to them. But my single object was the instruction of Episcopalians. I was, therefore, desirous to avoid controversy, and particularly all reasonable cause of offence to others. The doctrine of the Church, on the subject of Episcopacy, was published in Manuals of Devotion and Instruction, addressed to Episcopalians, and calculated for them alone. Now, sir, what was this but the "peaceful exercise of a common right?"* In what more unexceptionable mode could I have attempted to instruct Episcopalians in the principles of their church? In what more unexceptionable mode could I have admonished them of the danger and guilt of separating from that ministry which only their church declared *lawful?* If the terms in which this admonition was couched unavoidably affected other denominations, the fault was in the nature of the subject, not in the monitor. And as you declare that you "shall neither dispute the right of an Episcopalian to publish his own sentiments, nor when they happen to bear hard upon others, shall cry out against their uncharitableness," permit me to inquire, why you brand the exercise of this right with the most harsh and opprobrious

* Christian's Magazine, p. 90.

epithets? Think you that "uncharitable pretensions" (an epithet which you condemn the author of "Miscellanies" for using) sounds harsher in my ears than "arrogant," "extravagant" pretensions, "positions of deep-toned horror?" Compared with these denunciations, the declamations of the author of "Miscellanies" against "bigotry and superstition," are as the "gentle dew" to the angry "thunderbolt." To concede in the most unqualified terms the "right of an Episcopalian to publish his peculiar sentiments," and yet to denounce him as an aggressor upon other denominations the moment he decently exercises this right, is an outrage upon common sense.

The author of "Miscellanies" was censured by the "Layman" and "Cyprian" as an aggressor, because he bitterly inveighed against an Episcopalian for exercising, in the most unexceptionable mode, the right which you concede to him, "to publish his peculiar sentiments." The author of Miscellanies was deemed an unjustifiable aggressor, because, in a style of invective and ridicule, he attacked the principles of the Episcopal Church in the newspapers.

When a writer publishes animadversions on the erroneous principles of any religious denomination, in pointed addresses to them, or in pamphlets inviting general perusal, he may be considered as courting controversy. Yet if his reasoning be candid, and his style temperate and decent, he cannot on your principles be deemed censurable. You maintain, in the strongest language, the duty of earnestly contending for the faith. You maintain, that in this world of error and sin, religious controversy, or a comparison between the "conflicting claims" to that truth which "if we reject, we seal our perdition," becomes an imperious duty. You concede also to all denominations the right to defend their peculiar tenets. Yet the moment any denomination publishes a book in illustration or defence of its peculiar principles, it is to be considered, according to your reasoning, as a wanton aggression on the peaceful domains of others! This doctrine

changes even public confessions of faith, and formulas of religious instruction and devotion, into the darts and spears of contention. Mutual aggression and attack among Christians unavoidably result from the maintenance of their respective principles. If your reasoning be just, the *Episcopal Church* was long since *atttacked*, and my publications were strictly *defensive*. The "Constitution and Standards of the Associate-Reformed church in North-America," of which church you are a distinguished minister, was published several years before my books, under your most solemn sanction and superintendence. In this constitution,* "the distinction of superior and inferior clergy," a distinction which prevails among Episcopalians, and which lies at the foundation of their church, is styled "highly unscriptural and anti-Christian."† Will not your reasoning against me, which you advance with so much confidence, and which you seem to think is for ever to silence me, recoil upon yourself? You assert, "it is the dictate of common sense, that if an author print and publish severe reflections upon any body of men, he not only attacks them, but does it in the most open manner possible."‡ Now, you sir, and the Associate-Reformed Synod, have "printed and published severe reflections" upon Episcopalians. You have styled their ministry "unscriptural and anti-Christian." What apology can you make but the one which you put in my mouth? "You have no right, sir, to be offended with any part of my book. It is true, I have called your 'ministry unscriptural and anti-Christian,' but you should not construe these epithets into an attack upon you; for the least candour will enable you to perceive that this book was pub-

* Art. Church Government, book i. chap. 2. sec. 2, 5.

† It is very well known that the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, who drew up the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, *denounced* and *abjured* Episcopacy; as did also the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, who, in various acts, at different times, solemnly condemned it as unfounded in *scripture*, as a *popish and wicked hierarchy*.

‡ Christian's Magazine, p. 91.

lished for the use of our own connections." No, sir, this apology will not do. For, to apply still your own language, Episcopalians will not be "sent home perfectly satisfied to be denounced as having an 'unscriptural and anti-Christian' ministry, so often as the zealous" Dr. Mason, or the Associate-Reformed Synod, may "judge it conducive to the edification of their own particular friends." Do not misunderstand me. It is not my design to charge you with an *attack* upon Episcopalians in the publication of that book; but I have promised to make the weapons which you have aimed at me recoil upon yourself, and you must excuse me if I neither forget nor violate my promise. I appeal to our candid readers, whether the reasoning which proves that my books for the use of Episcopalians are an attack upon other denominations, does not also prove that the constitution and standards of your own church were an attack upon Episcopalians. This "constitution" (it may be said) is not the work of an individual, but of the Synod. But the number and respectability of the persons who published the book only aggravate the attack, which, according to *your* mode of reasoning, is contained in it. This work, however, was certainly published under *your* superintendence. At any rate, I am under no apprehension that you will disclaim any positions advanced in it.

But I hold in my hand a series of "Letters" which you published on "Frequent Communion." From these letters (page 89) I extract the following: "We reject in a mass the corruptions of popery, and of her ape, *prelacy*.* We renounce the religious observance of *Christmas*, *Epiphany*, *Easter*, *Ascension*, &c. and the *festivals* in honour of a troop of saints and saintesses, as *superstitious* and inconsistent with *gospel* worship, how graceful soever to the anti-Christian Calendar." Is it possible to speak of the institutions of the Episcopal Church in terms of greater contempt? Now, this

* Prelacy is the term by which Presbyterian writers frequently designate Episcopacy.

language you proclaimed to the public in your Letters published in 1798. And my Companions "for the Altar," and for the "Festivals and Fasts," were published in 1804. Should you not blush at your attempt to fix on me the charge of aggression?

I have also perused a missionary sermon, entitled, "The Triumph of the Gospel," preached some years ago before the New-York Missionary Society. In this sermon I find (at page 21) the following passage: "*Ecclesiastical dignitaries*, spiritual lords, and all the pageantry of the *hierarchy* in its *various modifications*, which have debased the gospel, and metamorphosed the kingdom of Christ to a kingdom of this world, will be finally *trampled in the dust, and despised by Christians.*" Now, sir, this sermon was preached before the appearance of my "Companion for the Altar." And what is the purport of the sentence above quoted? Among "ecclesiastical dignitaries" *bishops* are evidently included. A dignitary is "a clergyman advanced above the rank of a parochial *priest*."* A bishop ranks above a *priest*, and is, therefore, a dignitary. If by the hierarchy was meant only the papacy, why does the sentence run—"the hierarchy in its *various modifications*?" Episcopacy is surely a *modification* of the *hierarchy*. By this name you distinguish it † Bishops and Episcopacy then, "which have *debased the gospel*, will be finally *trampled* in the *dust*, *and despised* by Christians!" Let us apply to this passage your reasoning: "It is the dictate of common sense," you say, "that if an author print and publish severe reflections upon any body of men, he not only attacks them, but does it in the most open manner possible!" Now, a venerable divine of this city preached and published a sermon containing severe reflections upon Episcopalians, stating, in terms too evident to be mis-

* Johnson.

† Christian's Magazine, p. 101. When the adversaries of Episcopacy mean to express their contempt for it, they call it the *hierarchy*, the *prelacy*.

taken, that bishops and Episcopacy ("ecclesiastical dignitaries," "the hierarchy in its various modifications,") "had debased the gospel," and "would be finally trampled in the dust, and despised by Christians." And the Missionary Society of New-York requested and sanctioned the publication of this sermon. Here, then, according to *your* principle, was an "attack in the most open manner possible" upon Episcopalians, by a venerable divine, and by the New-York Missionary Society, consisting of Presbyterian divines and laymen. I pray not to be misunderstood. I mean no reflection nor censure on the New-York Missionary Society. The clergyman who preached the sermon to which I have alluded, for his learning and talents, his exemplary piety, commands my veneration: For his uniformly kind deportment to me, my gratitude is due to him. If he deemed the sentiment which I have quoted just, and the publication of it necessary to the edification of Christians, he possessed the right, it was his duty to preach and publish it. It is farthest from my intention to censure him for doing so, or the Missionary Society for sanctioning the publication. In order to resist, however, the charge of aggression, I am compelled, reluctantly, to prove, that *if your principle be correct*, Episcopalians were attacked before the appearance of my "Companion for the Altar."

You complain very bitterly of the conduct of an Episcopal clergyman, who, in a sermon preached several years since at a public ordination, denounced, as you conceive, the non-Episcopal clergy. It is with the deepest regret I am compelled to maintain, that, if you and your brethren have just cause of complaint against the sermon of the Episcopal clergyman, we have the same cause of complaint against the sermon which I have just quoted. When a person wishes to vent his indignation against any object, and to sink it into contempt, he says that it should be "trampled in the dust," it "should be *despised*." And this is the sentence pronounced on Episcopacy, which is a modification of the hier-

archy, by a non-Episcopal clergyman, in a printed discourse. But (you say) the non-Episcopal clergy were invited to hear the sermon which gave them so much offence, and this circumstance rendered the attack an *outrage!* There is no recollection of any such invitation having been given. But there was notice given in the newspapers of the preaching of the missionary sermon to which I allude; and surely Episcopalians as well as others were at least indirectly invited to attend. Where, then, the difference in the two cases? But I disclaim all wish or intention of fixing on the worthy and venerable preacher of the missionary sermon any design either to "attack" or to "outrage" Episcopalians. He honestly believed the sentiments he uttered. I do not presume to censure him for inculcating what he doubtless esteemed an important truth, and a subject of congratulation to all who looked for the purity and glory of the millennial church. But it really appears to me that the two cases above referred to are exactly parallel. The latter is rather the stronger case. For the missionary sermon reflecting on Episcopalians was not only preached, but *published.* And, therefore, according to you, as these "severe reflections" were "printed and published," they were not only an "attack," but an attack "in the most open manner possible." The deductions which bear hard upon the preacher of the missionary sermon come from yourself.

Ill-fated Episcopalians! your Episcopacy may be branded as "unscriptural and anti-Christian;" your bishops held up to detestation, as "lords in God's heritage."* Your hierarchy, charged with having "debased the gospel," with being "the ape of popery," may be consigned to infamy and destruction, "to be *trampled in the dust, and despised* by Christians." All this ye must bear patiently and silently. For the moment any one of you lifts up his voice in language however decent, to defend your hierarchy, to show to

* So styled in the Confession of Faith of a Calvinistic Church

his brethren the *guilt and danger* of separating from it, of *despising* it, and *trampling* it in the dust—a hue and cry is raised against him—to break his spirit—to crush his resolution—to blast his influence—to drown for ever his remonstrances!

Believe me, sir, I shall still escape "the unpopularity of being the aggressor." And I am principally anxious to escape it, because I do not *deserve* it, and am deeply conscious that the least idea of aggression was farthest from my thoughts or wishes. At the same time, I freely declare, that I can see no impropriety in any individual remarking with freedom, plainness, and force, on what he may deem the erroneous tenets of any body of men. If his strictures be decent and candid, it would, in my judgment, be unjust to affix any odium upon him for the exercise of that right of investigation which, on all subjects, is the hand-maid and the nurse of truth. I certainly deem the books I published fair objects of remark and animadversion. I concede the right of animadversion in its full extent, restrained only by decency and candour. But I solemnly protest against being condemned, even before my opinions are examined, by being denounced as a wanton and unprovoked aggressor.

But the inquiry has sometimes been made, and not by non-Episcopalians only—"Why, in order to the defence of the principles of your own church, should you deem it necessary to animadvert on the principles of others? Concede to you the right and the duty of proving the divine authority of the Episcopal ministry; why should you insist that non-Episcopalians have not a valid ministry?" Now, against such reasoning I can shelter myself under a principle which you kindly furnish me, that "*truth* can admit of no compromise with *error*, nor does *charity* require it." In maintaining certain principles of the Episcopal Church, there can be, there ought to be, no compromise with the errors that are opposed to these principles. I could not maintain the divine authority of the Episcopal ministry, without de-

nying the validity of a non-Episcopal ministry; for it is an essential principle in the Episcopal ministry that Bishops, as an order superior to Presbyters, have alone the power of ordination. Of course a ministry not Episcopally ordained cannot be a valid ministry. In several of the prayers in the Offices of Ordination of the Episcopal Church, it is asserted, that God, by "his divine providence and by his Holy Spirit, appointed divers orders of ministers in his Church;" and "Bishops," "Priests," and "Deacons" are ranked among the orders thus divinely appointed. That she acknowledges only Episcopal ordination as valid, is evident also from her *uniform* and *inviolate practice*. She does not receive any persons into standing as ministers who have not been *Episcopally* ordained. Whence this restriction if ordination by Presbyters is valid? What is ordination? Not the mere *mode of admission* to the privilege of officiating among some *particular* denomination of Christians. It is the *conferring of the ministerial commission* generally. Who confers this commission among Presbyterians? The Presbyters. Does the Church of England, or the Episcopal Church in America, acknowledge this ordination? No; for these churches never receive a Presbyterian minister until he has been Episcopally ordained.* If they considered that his ordination by Presbyters had conferred on him a valid ministerial

* Some few instances to the contrary in the Church of England, at the outset of the Reformation, cannot invalidate a *general* and *uniform* practice since that period. During the contentions and troubles of the Reformation, that some few irregularities occurred, is surely not surprising. If the few instances of some Presbyterian divines creeping into livings, by the aid and support of *political* leaders, would prove that the Church of England at the Reformation did not insist on Episcopal ordination, the instances that occurred during the same period of some laymen holding livings, would prove that the Church did not insist on any ordination at all! Long and uniform *practice* has settled it into a principle in the Church of England (and it is a principle which the Episcopal Church in America has never violated) that none are received as ministers but those who "have had Episcopal consecration or ordination." In regard, therefore, to the *present* principles of these churches there can be no dispute

commission, would it not be absurd, would it not be a solemn mockery for the Bishop to treat him as if he had never received a ministerial commission, as if he were a layman who was a candidate for orders, and proceed to ordain him? These principles with respect to ordination, the Episcopal Church has the same right to maintain which other denominations have to maintain various principles offensive to her. If any person will point out to me by what method I can maintain that Bishops alone have the power of ordination, and at the same time concede this power to Presbyters, he shall have my warmest thanks. He will save me from the painful necessity of holding opinions offensive to many persons for whose talents, piety and zeal I cherish the highest veneration.

But further. It is the solemn duty of every minister to explain to his people the sin of *schism*, and to guard them against it. It is considered by the Apostle as a "carnal" sin (1 Cor. iii. 3, &c.) Episcopalians pray in their Liturgy to be *delivered* from it. Their ministers, therefore, are surely bound to explain to them in what the sin consists. Now, the guilt of the sin of schism may in various ways be incurred. But, I presume there can be no doubt that when we separate from the duly authorized ministry, and commune with those who are not lawful ministers, we are guilty of this sin. On Episcopal principles, lawful ministers are Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Bishops alone possess the power of ordination. Of course it necessarily results, that none can be esteemed "lawful ministers" who "have not had Episcopal consecration or ordination."* Communing with ministers not thus duly authorized is, therefore, on Episcopal principles, to commit the sin of schism. And I would ask the *liberal* Episcopalian, or any other advocate for that modern liberality which startles at the very idea of opposing error, in what way an Episcopal minister is to explain to his people the sin of schism, and to guard them

* Preface to the Ordination Offices of the Episcopal Church.

against it, without warning them against separating from their "lawful" pastors, and communing with those who have not received "Episcopal consecration or ordination."* All that in this case can reasonably be required of the Episcopal minister is, that he should convey his warnings in a decent style, and through a channel the least calculated to irritate or offend. Now, sir, will you assert that the style of my admonitions was either intemperate or indecent? And if a manual of instruction and devotion designed for Episcopalians be an improper channel through which to address them on their peculiar principles, will you be so good as to inform me what is a proper channel? You affect to express your surprise that a form of preparation for the holy communion should be made the vehicle of these sentiments. But on the principles of all the Presbyterian churches, the sacraments may not be "dispensed by any but by a minister of the word, lawfully ordained."† Was it not then necessary, that a work on the holy communion should declare who are ministers "lawfully ordained" to dispense this sacrament; that it should warn Christians from receiving it from those who were not "lawfully ordained?"

You express also, though in an indirect manner, your surprise, that "the wholesome admonition" concerning those who are lawfully ordained to dispense the Lord's supper should be contained in a meditation for the evening before receiving that holy ordinance. It was my intention to comprise this "admonition" in the meditation for Satur-

* The Episcopal Minister does no more than every consistent Presbyterian is compelled to do. For if, as the Westminster Divines and the Constitution and Standards of your Church assert, "Presbyterian government is the *true* and *only* one which the Lord Jesus Christ hath prescribed in his word,"* and the orders of the Episcopal ministry "unscriptural and anti-Christian;" they who hear the word or receive the ordinances from this "unscriptural and anti-Christian" ministry, must be guilty of schism.

† Confession of Faith, chap. xxvii. sect. 4. Larger Catechism, 176

* Constitution of the Associate-Reformed Church, p. 475.

day morning I found, however, that this would have extended that meditation to an unusual and very disproportionate length. And as the preceding part of the work was printed off, I was compelled to place this "admonition" in the meditation for Saturday evening. Though, in the order of the meditations, it might have probably filled a more judicious place, yet I cannot admit that its present situation is wholly improper. It cannot be improper for a communicant, even on the very point of approaching the communion, to pause and inquire—Am I about to receive it from "a minister of the word, lawfully ordained" to dispense it? In the prayer annexed to this meditation for Saturday evening, the communicant prays that "in the exercise of *lively penitence and faith* he may humbly and thankfully partake of the ordinances of the church; and thus maintaining communion with it, derive from Jesus, its divine head, pardon, grace, consolation, triumph, everlasting glory."* He who sincerely offers up this supplication, will not be in an unfit temper to rise in the morning and prepare for receiving the sacred pledges of his Saviour's love.

What relation has the story of Mr. Wright to the present discussion? or how does it affect its merits? The direct assertion, that our defence of Episcopacy had been indecent or intemperate, could be met and immediately refuted.† Indirect assertion would be equally effectual in exciting clamour against us, and would in some measure shelter our accuser from the charge of aspersion. Your representation of what you conceive was very intemperate conduct in this Episcopal clergyman, tends to crush the innocent with the

* Companion for the Altar, p. 206.

† The appeal may be made to every candid person, whether in the "Companion for the Altar," and in the "Festivals and Fasts," obnoxious as may be the opinions, there is any *intemperance* or *indecency* of style. If in the "Episcopal controversy" a higher tone of remonstrance has been assumed, it is fully justified by the flood of invective, sarcasm, and ridicule poured forth by the opponent of Episcopacy in that controversy?

guilty—to fix on myself and other recent advocates of Episcopacy, an odium which we do not merit; and to rouse against us an indignant clamour, which will not listen to the voice of sober argument and remonstrance. You state that this Mr. Wright "declared to the faces of some of the most venerable ministers in this city, that all clergymen not Episcopally ordained, are imposters; their commissions forgeries; and their sacraments blasphemy." But is it not possible that the indignant feelings of those who heard Mr. Wright deliver sentiments obnoxious to them may have somewhat exaggerated his language; or that at this distance of time it may be unintentionally misstated? I can only assert that the Episcopal clergy who heard him cannot recollect that he used the very strong expressions which you impute to him. It seems, as you assert, my books are a continuance of this same system of attack; the same "*aspersions*"* are "repeated" by me, "though in a more decent language"—that is, I am still a calumniator, though rather more decent in my "aspersions" than Mr. Wright! Sir, I protest against this conduct as unjust, uncandid, and, I may add, (from its injurious tendency on my own reputation and feelings) cruel. The sermon of Mr. Wright must have been preached several years before I was in orders—and though some *slight rumours* of it *recently* reached me, yet you are the first person from whom I have received a statement of its contents, or of the circumstances attending its delivery. How, then, could I be guilty of wilfully continuing an "attack," which I was ignorant had ever been made? How can I be justly answerable for the intemperate conduct and language of a person whom I never knew, and with whom I never had any kind of intercourse?

If, sir, as you insinuate, there has been any system of attack organized against non-Episcopalians, I have not been privy to it. My books have no share in it. I have the satisfaction to know that my Diocesan approves of the senti-

* Observe, sir, "aspersions" are *calumnies*.

ments contained in those books; but neither he nor my brethren knew any thing of them until they saw them in print; nor are they privy to the contents of these letters. And yet I can see no impropriety, when the church is assailed, in her friends uniting to defend her. I repeat the solemn declaration which I have made in the preface to the "Collection of Essays" which you are now reviewing, that "it never occurred to me that the publication of those books would be the cause of offence to others."* They only contain principles which have been maintained and repeatedly published by eminent divines.

If, sir, you would honour with a perusal the Life of Dr. Johnson, the first President of King's, now Columbia College, you would find perhaps some facts that would probably hold you "in suspense between the gaze of astonishment and the swell of indignation!" Dr. CUTLER, the President of Yale College, Dr. JOHNSON, and several of the most eminent clergy in Connecticut, were induced, at a period when the Episcopal Church was scarcely known in the state, to examine the subject of Episcopacy; and finally, in opposition to the most powerful influence, embraced the principles for which you denounce me, and went to England for Episcopal ordination. And yet, from the style of your address to me, one would suppose that I was the first who in this country ever had the presumption to urge such "extravagant and arrogant pretensions." These principles always have had their advocates, and will continue to be defended, any

* My republishing the "Essays on Episcopacy" which appeared in the Albany Centinel in a separate volume, with notes and comments, was a defensive measure. The Author of Miscellanies had attacked Episcopal principles in the newspapers. As his essays were a continued series of bold and concise assertions, completely to detect and to answer them by any thing like reasoning, required his opponents to enter on an extensive field. And as the printers at length closed their papers to the discussion, many of the assertions of the Author of Miscellanies remained unanswered, which it was necessary, therefore, to notice in a separate publication.

thing you or others can say to the contrary nothwithstanding.

But the most extraordinary declaration relative to this "attack," as you are pleased to term it, is the following: "A circumstance which rendered this attack an outrage, was the care of the Episcopal clergy to circulate notice of the ordination, and their solicitude for the attendance of their non-Episcopal brethren!" Now, sir, before you hazarded this most serious charge against the Episcopal clergy—a charge which, fixing on them an "outrage," would prove that they possessed neither the mild forbearance of Christians, the dignity of clergymen, nor the manners of gentlemen, should you not have paused, and ascertained, beyond the possibility of mistake, several important particulars? Are you satisfied on good authority that "the Episcopal clergy expressed a solicitude for the attendance of their non-Episcopal brethren?" I have ascertained from the officiating Bishop and the only two Episcopal clergy now resident in this city who attended the ordination, that they knew nothing of any invitation having been given to the non-Episcopal clergy, or of any solicitude having been expressed for their attendance. But admit the fact: are you able to prove, have you any satisfactory reason to believe, that the Episcopal clergy were previously acquainted with the nature of Mr. Wright's sermon, or with the obnoxious passages to which you refer? You can neither prove, nor have you any satisfactory reason to believe this circumstance—and the truth of this only can authorize you in the serious charge you have brought against the Episcopal clergy, and rescue it from the imputation of being more unjust and indecorous than the conduct which you ascribe to them. I am authorized to assert, that the Episcopal clergy were wholly ignorant what would be the contents of Mr. Wright's sermon, and the style in which he would deem it proper to convey his observations.—"Alas—alas"—"Pudet—pudet"*—Were I disposed to retort, might I not lament, that persons who make such

* Your favourite expressions

pretensions to extraordinary piety, who claim to themselves the exclusive title of "evangelical," should forget the first dictate of a truly evangelical spirit, and inconsiderately render themselves liable to the charge of committing an outrage against the very individuals on whom they attempt to fix this crime? No, sir; no—I make no such retort. I cast no imputation of wilful misrepresentation or perversion. There has been some misapprehension—some want of recollection—and more inconsiderate zeal in this business—Let it be covered with the mantle of charity.

---

## LETTER VI.

SIR,

THE charge of *aggression* I have thus proved utterly unfounded.

Your other charges may be thus summed up.

That I maintain, that communion with the Episcopal priesthood is a condition of salvation which is not only *indispensable* on the part of *man* (in which sense I apply the word indispensable,) but which *God* himself will not dispense with; and that "the simple fact of separation from the Episcopal priesthood" renders all *repentance and faith unavailing*, "mars the religion of non-Episcopalians, and renders it stark naught!"—and that thus I make the "only alternative, EPISCOPACY OR PERDITION!!"*

That I "make particular views of external order the hinging point of salvation"†—that I "place the external order of the Church upon a level with the merits of our Lord Jesus, in the article of acceptance before God;"‡ that "with respect to non-Episcopalians I make Episcopacy of *primary*, and faith in the Redeemer of secondary importance;"‡ and that I maintain that "faith in Christ is impossible where there is no communion with the Bishop."‡

* Christian's Magazine, p. 94, 95. † p. 98. ‡ p. 99.

Now, sir, before you can be "justified in uttering a syllable which only looks towards conclusions" which hold me up as a monster of arrogance and impiety, unfit to be tolerated among Christians, you ought to be not only "perfectly certain of your premises," but that your conclusions also are fairly and legitimately drawn.

I utterly disclaim the sentiments you impute to me.

I utterly deny the truth of your charges.

I pledge myself to prove that you support them by *partial* and *false* views of my opinions—by uncandidly *torturing* them to an *extreme*—and by *illogical* deductions which a *just* reasoner should blush to make, and a *candid* reasoner should scorn to enlist into his service.

I pledge myself to prove that the same uncandid methods would attach the same odium to your own principles; and that I lay no greater stress on *external order*, on *communion with the church through its ministry and ordinances*, than the standards and confessions of faith of the Presbyterian churches will warrant.

To prove these points, I pledge myself. Is there a candid reader of your review in which these charges against me are contained, who will refuse to accompany me in my vindication?

I utterly disclaim the sentiments you impute to me. I utterly deny the truth of your charges.

Do I maintain that *God will not dispense with communion with the Episcopal priesthood*, when I express my belief that he will dispense with it in the cases of all those who do not "*negligently* or *wilfully* continue in a state of separation from it;"* who do not, through criminal *negligence* or *wilful obstinacy*, contemn the means of arriving at the truth, and resist the light of conviction? Or do I maintain that "separation from the Episcopal priesthood renders faith and repentance unavailing, and mars the religion of non-Episcopalians," when I express my belief that the "humble, the penitent,

* Companion for the Altar, p. 203.

and obedient," who reject the authorized ministry, not "*negligently* or *wilfully*," but through "*involuntary error*," will still have "mercy" extended to them?* Am I guilty then of making the "only alternative, Episcopacy or Perdition?" When my principles thus extend mercy to many who reject that "external order" which I believe has the sanction of divine authority, do I make "external order the hinging point of salvation?" Do I "place this order on a level with the merits of Christ," when the principle which I lay at the foundation of my work is, "that we are saved from the guilt and dominion of sin by the divine merits and grace of a crucified Redeemer?"† Is my making (according to you) "faith in Christ of secondary, and Episcopacy of primary importance," consistent with your own declaration of the "evangelical strain" of many parts of the book? And while I expressly acknowledge that the "humble, the penitent, and obedient," even though they should, through "involuntary error," reject the authorized ministry, and of course the Bishop, will enjoy the "blessings of God's favour"—is your assertion correct, that I "make faith in Christ impossible but through communion with the Bishop?" You may say indeed, that I "flinch from the *consequences* of my own doctrine." By and by, I shall consider this point, and show that you are as incorrect and uncandid in deducing consequences as you are in stating opinions. My simple object now is to show that *I do not hold the obnoxious opinions* which you impute to me. For, to use your own language, I "am sure that the *drift*, and have little doubt that the *design*," of your review "is to force plain people into the conclusion," that I *really* maintain the opinions which, by most unfair deduction from my writings, you fix upon me.

What, according to your representations, is the amount of my reasonings? That *all are consigned to* "PERDITION" who are not within the pale of my own church. No per-

* Companion for the Altar, p. 203.

† Preface to the Companion for the Altar, p. 5.

sons will believe that I am capable of pronouncing this most impious judgment, when they read the following, contained in the very books on which you animadvert: "The judge of the whole earth will do right. The grace of God quickens and animates *all the degenerate children of Adam.* The mercy of the Saviour is co-extensive with the ruin into which sin hath plunged mankind. And in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him."* "*We presume to judge no man*, leaving all judgment to that *Being* who is alone qualified to make allowance for the *ignorance*, *invincible prejudices*, *imperfect reasonings*, and *mistaken judgments* of his frail creatures."† "*All men* are in the hands of an infinitely *merciful* and righteous God, who will *judge them according to their works.*"‡ "Though the institutions of the Almighty are indispensably binding upon men, he is not himself restricted by them. Every benevolent heart, therefore, ardently cherishes the delightful belief that *mercy will at length* be extended to *all who humbly and earnestly seek to know and to do the will* of their heavenly Master."§ Episcopalians maintain, that "in conformity to the order handed down from the beginning, Bishops only have the power of ordination, and as a *general* proposition they maintain that Episcopal ministrations only are valid. At the same time they are disposed to believe, that when any church cannot obtain the lawful succession, God, who 'is not a hard master, reaping where he has not sown, and gathering where he has not strawed,' will mercifully dispense with it. Nay, that he will graciously accept and bless the ministrations of those who have not a lawful call; when the error is not chargeable to wilful neglect of the means of information, nor to obstinate resistance to the light of conviction. In this way does the author of the

* Companion for the Altar, p. 202.

† Companion for the Festivals and Fasts, p. 60.

‡ Companion for the Festivals and Fasts, p. 204.

§ Preface to the Collection of Essays on Episcopacy, p. 7.

'Companion for the Altar' reconcile truth with charity: in this way does he embrace in the arms of fraternal benevolence all who, according to the talents bestowed on them by their gracious Maker, seek to know and to do his will."*

Will you hold sentiments equally *charitable* with those which I have advanced in the foregoing extracts? Will you, "in the sincerity of your soul," cherish the delightful hope of that "glorious consummation—when the same generous zeal for God and truth, which too often, in this world of folly and confusion, sets those at widest variance whom the similitude of virtuous feelings should the most unite, shall be the cement of an indissoluble friendship; when the innumerable multitude of all nations, kindreds, and people (why should I not add of all sects and parties?) assembled round the throne, shall, like the first Christians, be of one soul, and one mind; giving praise with one consent to him that sitteth on the throne, and to the Lamb that was slain to redeem them by his blood?"† No, sir, I will venture to say that you will not meet me on this broad ground of charity, which extends the favour of God to all his sincere servants, whatever may be their unintentional and involuntary errors. I will venture to pledge myself that anxious as you are to represent me as hurling to perdition all who are not within the pale of my own church, your charity will not take this wide range. For, referring to some of the charitable opinions which are above expressed, you intimate, "that in maintaining them, if a little pressed, I might perhaps find I had no ingenuity to spare."‡ Come, sir, press me on these assertions. The public will soon see who it is that maintains positions "arrogant, extravagant," and revolting to common sense and reason.

But you will say, I "flinch from the consequences of my

* Collection of Essays on Episcopacy, p. 208.

† Preface to the Collection of Essays on Episcopacy, p. 8.

‡ Christian's Magazine, p. 87.

own doctrines"—"my concessions are in diametrical repugnance to my arguments."*

I proceed, therefore, to prove that you support your charges by *partial* and *false* views of my opinions; by uncandidly *torturing* them to an extreme; and by illogical deductions unworthy of a just and candid reasoner. I shall show that the same uncandid methods would attach the same odium to many of your own principles on the subject of church communion; and that I lay no greater stress on external order, on communion with the church through its ministry and ordinances, than the standards and confessions of faith of the Presbyterian churches will warrant.

From the criminality of rejecting that ministry which has alone the seal of divine authority, I expressly and repeatedly except all who labour under "involuntary error." But this "relief," you say, "is not worth accepting," because "the instances in which it would be substantiated, would be rare indeed."† And this position you establish by falsely representing me as confounding together what are totally distinct, "*unavoidable* error," and "*involuntary* error." *Unavoidable error* can only be committed where there is no "access to the means of instruction." But *involuntary error* may be committed even where instruction sheds the full blaze of light. They fall within the exception of *unavoidable error*, who *have not* access to the means of *information*. And they fall within the exception of *involuntary error*, who, possessing the means of investigating truth, do not *neglect* these means, nor *wilfully* resist the light of conviction. These two excusable kinds of error will include all the sincere inquirers after truth; who, I expressly admit, will not be condemned for rejecting the divinely authorized priesthood. Separation from this priesthood I make excusable, whenever "it proceeds from *involuntary and unavoidable ignorance or error*.‡ Now, sir, what is the construction which common sense and

* Christian's Magazine, p. 101. † p. 94

‡ Companion for the Altar, p. 203.

common candour would put upon my language? Certainly that in my judgment THEY are excusable for *rejecting* the authorized ministry of the church, who either do not possess the means of information, or are prevented from availing themselves of these means—for their *ignorance* is *unavoidable* and *involuntary*. That THEY are excusable who remain in *error* on the subject, through the imperfect means of information in their power—for their *error* is evidently *unavoidable*. That THEY are excusable who, neither *neglecting* the means of information, nor *wilfully* resisting the light of conviction, remain still in error—for their error is *involuntary*, is neither negligent nor wilful; and must be referred to that power of prejudice, to that force of early prepossessions, or to some of those inscrutable causes which, we know, often blind the understandings and pervert the judgments of the greatest and best of men. You were bound in common justice and candour, as well as by the obvious meaning of terms, to place the above construction on my language. In the very passage of my writings which you have quoted,* I fix the imputation of "great guilt" and "imminent danger" on those only "who *negligently* or *wilfully* continue in a state of separation from the duly authorized ministry of the church"—*negligently*, through inattention to the subject—*wilfully*, through resistance to the honest conviction of their minds.

Whom then do I exempt from what you are pleased to term my "sweeping sentence of proscription?" I exempt from the guilt of rejecting the authorized ministry of the church, the thousands who do not possess the means of investigating the subject; or are prevented by their situation and peculiar circumstances from pursuing the investigation —their *ignorance* is *unavoidable* and *involuntary*. I exempt the thousands of "humble, penitent, and obedient"† Christians, who, possessing only imperfect means of information,

* Christian's Magazine, p. 86 and 87.

† Companion for the Altar, p. 203.

or after an *honest* and *diligent* examination, continue still in a state of "separation from the authorized ministry"—their error is not occasioned by *negligence*—it is not *wilful*—it is *involuntary;* and, therefore, in the eye of a just and merciful Judge, *excusable*. What charity, I demand, can be more extensive? To your ingenuity in distorting my opinions, and placing a false construction on my language, I am willing to do homage. And did not the subject concern the infinitely momentous truths of religion, I might be disposed to allow you the gratification of displaying, in the arts of distortion and false deduction, talents, which I confess, in my opinion, are unrivalled. But when the object of these arts is to fix on me the execrable and impious imputation of rendering, in regard to non-Episcopalians, "repentance towards God, faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ, conformity to his image, and zeal for his glory, of no avail;" when it is the object of these arts to represent me as holding opinions which "mar the religion of non-Episcopalians, and render it stark naught," and which make the "only alternative, Episcopacy or Perdition!!"*—when by these arts of distortion and false deduction you brand me with the odious criminality of maintaining "positions of deep-toned horror"—I am justified, I am compelled, by the most sacred principles of duty, to resist and expose these arts, as in the extreme ungenerous and cruel.

In admitting that *involuntary error* absolves from guilt, I have prepared a broad shield of charity which will cover all the sincere inquirers after truth. *Involuntary* error arises from *mistaken judgment*, and leaves the *heart* sincerely desirous to embrace the *truth*. It is, therefore, compatible with the most sincere attachment to truth, and the most diligent investigation of it. And unless you will maintain the perfectibility of human reason; unless you will disdain the supposition that in any corner of your heart lurks some dominant prejudice or passion which may obscure or mislead your re-

* These imputations you fix on me. Christian's Magazine, p. 94, 95.

searches, permit me to observe, that distinguished as may be your attainments, and soaring as may be your powers, you too must take refuge under that shield of involuntary error which you so contemptuously reject. When the humiliating conviction of the weakness of the human mind, and the power of prejudice, overwhelms me with doubt and apprehension, the firm persuasion, that my merciful Judge will not impute involuntary error to me as a crime, is my hope and solace. The contrary supposition, revolting to every principle of justice, is instantly repelled by every view which reason or scripture affords us of the goodness, mercy, and justice of that almighty Being who "knoweth whereof we are made, and remembereth that we are but dust." "He is not a hard master, reaping where he has not sown, and gathering where he has not strawed." "And where a man has a willing mind, he is accepted according to what he has, and not according to what he has not." "The charity then of Mr. H. and his brethren," is not without "warrant." The mercy which rests on this charity is not "precarious."

You place a false construction on the following passage: "But where the gospel is proclaimed, communion with the church by the participation of its ordinances at the hands of the duly authorized priesthood, is the *indispensable condition of salvation.*" You surely are not ignorant that a condition of salvation may be considered as indispensable, either with respect to GOD, who imposes the condition, or with respect to MAN, on whom the condition is imposed. There are certain conditions of salvation which the Almighty himself will not *dispense with.* He will not, for instance, dispense with holiness—For "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." There are other conditions of salvation, in regard to which, though *man* does not possess the right of dispensation, we may be assured, that in certain cases, a merciful and sovereign *God* will exercise this right. Of this description are all the *positive institutions* of religion; among which are the church, its ministry and ordinances. When, therefore, in the

sentence above quoted, I rank "communion with the church through its duly authorized ministry," as an "indispensable condition of salvation," my meaning evidently is, that MAN has no authority to *dispense* with this condition, to fulfil it or not as he pleases; for, in the very next sentence, which is in *connection* with the former, I express the belief, that GOD *will*, in certain cases, *dispense with* this condition. And I applied the term indispensable to communion with the authorized ministry, in order to oppose the opinion too commonly entertained, that the ministry of the church may be *dispensed* with, or altered, as *man* may please; and that, of course, communion with the ministry originally constituted by Christ and his Apostles, is a matter of no moment. Nor was the term improperly applied in this sense. Suppose an unbeliever should solemnly profess to you his penitence and faith. You become satisfied of his sincerity. But he denies the necessity of communion with the visible church the "nursery of the church in heaven,"* and of baptism and the Lord's supper. Would you not be justified in the following address to him? "Sir, it is your *indispensable* duty to commune with the *visible* church by baptism and the Lord's supper. The standards of faith of the Presbyterian churches maintain, on the authority of scripture, that 'out of the church there is *ordinarily* no possibility of salvation.'† Into this church baptism is the mode of admission.‡ By this sacrament and by the Lord's supper, which are 'signs and seals of the covenant of grace,'§ your 'ingrafting into Christ,' and all the 'benefits of Christ's death,' are *sealed* to you as a true believer.‖ With the necessity of communion with the visible church, and with these sacraments, *man* has no right to *dispense*. Though in the cases of penitent and true believers, who do not *negligently* or *wilfully* contemn these institutions, a merciful *God* will

* So styled by you. Christian's Magazine, introduction, p. 9.

† Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Churches, chap. xxv. sec. 2.

‡ Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Churches, chap. xxviii. 1.

§ Chap. xxvii. 1. ‖ Chap. xxix. 1.

*dispense* with them; yet as far as respects *my* authority, and *your* duty, they are *indispensable* conditions of salvation." I see not where would be the inaccuracy of such language. You justify it in your "Letters on Frequent Communion." It is one principal object of these letters (p. 6, &c.) to prove your position, that "frequent communion is an *indispensable* duty." Were I to deal with this assertion in the same uncandid manner by which you attempt to fix "CRIME or CONTRADICTION" upon me, you would be placed in a very awkward predicament. I might argue thus—If the duty be *indispensable*, no possible excuses can justify the neglect of it. And if they who neglect it are justifiable in this neglect, it is not indispensable: otherwise, the definition might run thus—*an indispensable duty is that which may be dispensed with*. The only alternative then is frequent communion, or crime in violating an indispensable duty. How then will you answer for your conduct, in refusing the communion to a person confined for months, and perhaps years, to a sick room, and thus involving him in the awful guilt of violating the indispensable duty of frequent communion! No, sir, I presume your acceptation of the word indispensable is the same in this case as when I apply it to communion with the authorized priesthood. There are certain cases in which you will acknowledge that Christians are absolved from the duty of frequent communion. And there are also cases in which I maintain that they are absolved, in the sight of God, from the guilt of rejecting the authorized ministry. It would indeed be absurd to say, that "an indispensable condition may be dispensed with"—if the terms be applied in one and the same sense. But surely "a condition *indispensable*," as it respects *man's* authority or right, may yet be "*dispensed with*" by that *God* who is supreme in authority and power. What now, sir, becomes of your attempt to make my only alternative "contradiction or crime?" What becomes of your attempt, by perverting my language to a meaning different from that in which my explicit declarations should have

led you to understand it, to fix on me the odious and impious imputation of "making the only alternative, EPISCOPACY or *Perdition ! !*"*

You charge me with "placing the external order of the church upon a level with the merits of our Lord Jesus in the article of acceptance with God." It is the least of the criminality of such a tenet, that it "wounds the bosom of tender piety." In imputing it to me, you overwhelm me with the awful guilt of derogating from the supreme efficacy of that precious blood which alone shields the sinner from the wrath of an offended God. In the *sense* in which *you* understand the term "*indispensable*," I would not apply it to either *faith* or *external order*. Where the gospel is proclaimed, faith in Christ, and communion with that visible body of which he is the head, and which he redeems and sanctifies, are conditions with which *man* has no authority to *dispense*. As, however, I have repeatedly expressed the belief that *God* will *dispense*, in cases of involuntary error, with what I consider regular and valid communion with the church, it is evident that I do not place "external order and faith in Christ" upon a level. But grant that I make them in the same sense indispensable: does it follow that I "place external order on a level with the merits of our Lord Jesus?" May I not consistently maintain that these all-sufficient merits are the only grounds of the acceptance of our faith, and also of our obedience to that external order which God has prescribed? In your zeal to fix on me the blasphemous doctrine, that *obedience* to *external order* is of as much avail to salvation, as "the merits of our Lord Jesus," you evidently place "*faith*" on a level with these merits. On the supposition that I make "soundness in external order" an indis-

* By the same disingenuous statement of the sense in which I apply the term "indispensable," your friend and co-adjutor, Mr. M'Leod, represents me in his ecclesiastical catechism (p. 113,) as "excluding from the hopes of happiness hereafter all who are not Episcopalians; and even all Episcopalians who do not receive the Lord's supper."

pensable condition of salvation, I am guilty, according to you, of placing external order on a level with the merits of Christ. Therefore, as you make *faith* an *indispensable* condition, nay "the hinging point of salvation,"* by your own reasoning it follows, that you place *faith* "on a level with the merits of our Lord Jesus in the article of acceptance with God"—that is, *faith*, which (though it be formed in the soul by divine grace) is an act of the understanding and the will, and therefore a *human performance*, as much so as "*soundness in external order*," has as great influence towards our salvation as "the *merits of the Lord Jesus!!*"† I mean not, however, to impute this position to you. But you must take your choice—either acknowledge that your reasoning against me is fallacious, or incur the censure of placing *human performances* on a level with the merits of Christ. Whether these performances be *faith*, or *soundness in external order*, is of no consequence. God forbid that I should depreciate faith as a Christian grace, or attempt to lower its rank among the conditions of salvation. But it is surely impious to place *any qualifications in the creature*, even though they may be wrought in him (as faith certainly is) through the agency of the Holy Spirit, upon a "level

* Christian's Magazine, p. 98.

† It really appears to me, that in what you say of *faith*, you are in danger of running from the popish absurdity of the *merit of works* into the equally great absurdity of the *merit of faith*. In fact, I think, this is an error to which Calvinistic writers in general expose themselves. The instrumentality of faith in our justification is concisely and clearly stated by Bishop HORSELY, whom I quote with the more pleasure, because he has been supposed by some (in my judgment unjustly) to be favourable to the *peculiarities* of Calvinism. "It is not by the *merit* of our *faith* more than by the *merit* of our *works* that we are *justified:* there is indeed no hope for any merit of our own, but through the *efficacy of our Lord's atonement*. For that we 'are *justified* by *faith*' is not on account of any merit in our faith; but because faith is the first principle of that communion between the believer's soul and the divine Spirit, on which the whole of our spiritual life depends." Bishop Horsely's Charge to his Clergy, 1790.

with *the merits of Christ* in the article of acceptance with God."

I complain, that in your attempt to fix on me the imputation of making "Episcopacy of primary, and faith of secondary importance,"* you have materially misstated a passage in my writings. This passage you thus introduce: "We are told again, that 'whoever IS in communion with the bishop, the supreme governor of the church upon earth, IS in communion with Christ the head of it; and whoever IS NOT in communion with the bishop, IS thereby cut off from communion with Christ,' and this is said to be a 'general conclusion' 'established' by 'the uniform testimony of ALL the apostolic and primitive writers." Now, the passage which you *dissever* and *alter*, and the parts of which you *arrange* to suit your own purposes, is as follows: "The uniform *testimony* of all the apostolic and primitive writers establishes the general conclusion, that whoever WAS in communion with the bishop, the supreme governor of the church upon earth, WAS in communion with Christ the head of it; and whoever WAS not in communion with the bishop, WAS thereby cut off from communion with Christ."† The difference is striking and material. According to your quotation of this passage, you make me state a *doctrine* of my own, in *terms* of my own choice. Whereas, the passage as it stands in the Festivals and Fasts, and in Daubeny, from which it is taken, states an *historical fact*, that such WAS the opinion of the APOSTOLIC and PRIMITIVE WRITERS. The difference, I say, is striking and material. For in the passage as you state it, I am answerable not merely for the doctrine *intended* to be conveyed, but for the *language* also; which, in such ingenious hands as yours, may be twisted and perverted to a dangerous and erroneous construction. But in the passage, as it appears in Daubeny, and in the Festivals and Fasts, the Apostolic and primitive writers alone are answerable for the

* Christian's Magazine, p. 99, 100.

† Companion for the Festivals and Fasts, p. 59.

*terms* in which they convey their doctrine. And as it was your object, from this passage, to raise in your readers that "gaze of astonishment or swell of indignation" which held you "in suspense," "after perusing it"—it was unwarrantable in you to distort and alter the passage, and change the arrangement of the parts.

The primitive fathers believed what the Presbyterian confessions of faith assert, that "out of the *visible church* there is no ordinary possibility of salvation."* And as they knew no church without a bishop at the head of it,† of course they were compelled to conclude, that there was no "*ordinary possibility* of salvation" but through the bishop. The only difference between you and them is, that they believed there could be no *visible* church but where there was a bishop; and you believe a "perfect equality in the ministry" to be the principle of church unity.‡ You both agree that *visible communion* with Christ is maintained by *communion with the church*, through baptism and the Lord's supper. For, according to the Presbyterian confessions of faith, these ordinances were instituted "to put a *visible* difference between *those* who *belong* unto the *church* and the *rest of the world.*"§

Your confounding this *visible* communion with Christ through his church, with that *spiritual* communion which commences in true faith, but which must be "sealed" and "nourished" by the ordinances of the Church, has led you to represent me as maintaining that "there is no access to communion with Christ but through the bishop;" and that "faith in Christ is impossible where there is no communion with the bishop."‖ That there can be no *visible* communion

* Presbyterian Confession of Faith, chap. xxv.

† "It was the *general* received opinion of the *ancient Christian world*, that *Ecclesia est in Episcopo*, the *outward being of a church*, consisted in *the having of a bishop*." Hooker, book vii. sec. 5.

‡ Christian's Magazine, introduction, p. 12, 13.

§ Presbyterian Confession of Faith, chap. xxvii.

‖ Christian's Magazine, p. 99.

with Christ but through the bishop, I undoubtedly maintain. For, on Episcopal principles, none but a bishop can give a valid commission to administer those *ordinances* on which this visible communion depends. But *spiritual* communion with Christ, that communion whereby we spiritually discern his gracious offices, and apply them to our souls, depends upon the exercise of genuine faith. While, therefore, I maintain that "true faith vitally unites its possessor to Christ," I can consistently maintain, that this communion must be "sealed," must be "confirmed," by communion with the church through its duly authorized ministers; and that he who *wilfully* rejects this communion with the visible church, "out of which there is no *ordinary* possibility of salvation," will forfeit those blessings to which his communion with Christ by faith would otherwise entitle him. What God hath joined together let not man put asunder. *Baptism* and the *Lord's supper* are, on Presbyterian principles, the "seals of the covenant."* And can he lay any claim to the blessings of this covenant who wilfully rejects its "holy seals?" If he can, to what purpose serve these seals? And if he cannot, as these "seals" are, on Presbyterian principles, "not to be dispensed by any but a *minister* of the word, *lawfully ordained*,"† does not *communion with Christ*, through the "seals" of the covenant, depend, yourself being judge, on *communion* with *lawful ministers*? The only difference between us then is on the question, Who are *lawful ministers*? We both agree that by true faith the believer becomes interested in the blessings of the covenant; but that to these blessings (cases of unavoidable ignorance and involuntary error excepted) he can have no regular title before they are sealed and confirmed to him in those divine ordinances which Christ instituted to be the "*means* whereby we receive" these blessings, "and a *pledge* to assure us thereof."‡

* Presbyterian Confession of Faith, chap. xxvii. xxviii. xxix.

† Presbyterian Confession of Faith, chap. xxvii. 4.

‡ Church Catechism.

Nor is your charge just, that I lessen the importance of faith. On my principles, without *true faith* all external communion with Christ through his church can be of no avail, and will only tend to our greater condemnation. I assert, that to the "BELIEVER" only are "the merits and grace of the Redeemer applied, in the *devout* and *humble* participation of the *ordinances* of the church, administered by a priesthood, who derive their authority, by regular transmission, from Christ."* "Pardon, salvation, and grace, the inestimable blessings of this sacred ordinance (the Lord's supper) are conveyed only to the TRUE BELIEVER."† "Communion with the church is the appointed mode by which the *faith* and obedience of Christians is to be quickened and preserved, and made acceptable unto God. But unless their communion with the church conduces to this end, and advances them into a conformity to Christ their holy and divine head, it is not sincere, and will not be effectual to their salvation. Those who, admitted into the church, live in a course of sin and disobedience, will incur the heavy condemnation of having *resisted God's grace*, of having *done despite unto his spirit*, of having contemned the offers of divine mercy, and counted the *blood of the covenant an unholy thing*."‡ So far then from your accusation being just, that I "hold up Episcopacy as of primary, and faith in Christ as of secondary importance;"§ on the contrary, I make all effectual or beneficial communion with the bishop to depend on faith; and, agreeably to your own conclusion, "that the one upon which the existence of the other depends must be the more important of the two,"‖ I make, of course, faith in Christ of more importance than communion with the bishop. This communion with the bishop can take place only through baptism and the Lord's supper, dispensed by ministers Epis-

* Preface to the Companion for the Altar, p. 5.
† Companion for the Altar, p. 111.
‡ Companion for the Festivals and Fasts, p. 203.
§ Christian's Magazine, p. 100. ‖ p. 100.

copally ordained. And for baptism in the case of adults, and for the Lord's supper, faith is a preparatory, an essential qualification. As, therefore, on my principles, faith *precedes* communion with the bishop, it is *distinct from* this communion, and *independent* of it.* How then can I be accused of making "faith impossible where there is no communion with the bishop," and of holding principles which make "all non-Episcopalians, of necessity, infidels?"† All your ingenious reasoning, which appears to have cost you so much labour, and by which you attempt to justify your odious charges against me, is founded on an uncandid construction of my language, on consequences *unfairly* deduced from my principles.

Really, sir, it pains me to be compelled to charge you with having, in my judgment, wielded the pen of controversy with so little candour and moderation. It is impossible for any person to write in such a manner as to prevent insulated passages and expressions from being tortured into a meaning utterly foreign to his sentiments and intentions, and to the general strain of his reasoning. Hence no rule is more universally acknowledged; no rule more sacredly regarded by all candid critics, than that which determines the sentiments of a writer from the general tenor of his remarks, and permits the various parts of his writings mutually to explain and qualify each other. Did I possess your ingenuity and vigour of remark, and were disposed to violate this rule of candid criticism, I could deduce from *detached* parts of the sacred oracles themselves, the most contradictory and even blasphemous opinions. This obvious and ne-

* This is doubtless in a certain sense true. But if, through "communion with the bishop," we enjoy the highest *fellowship with Christ;* and if this fellowship be designed to exalt and perfect within us the essential graces of the Christian character, may it not be questionable how *far* or how *long* we can have *gospel faith* without "communion with the bishop," or through him with CHRIST the divine head of the Church, which the gospel enjoins as so important a means of grace?—ED.

† Christian's Magazine, p. 99.

cessary rule, which should be sacred with every just reasoner, is, in your hands, no more than a straw in the hands of a giant. Rarely, rarely indeed, have you the candour and justice to extend it to my writings. It is your invariable practice to take particular expressions, and without considering their connection with other passages which qualify their application, and determine the meaning in which I use them, to force them into whatever sense it may suit your purpose. And you act thus unfairly, not to convict me of *venial* errors, but to fix on me "positions of deep-toned horror!" Is this to "do to others as you would that they should do to you?" Honestly ask your own heart. Appeal to your own conscience.

---

## LETTER VII.

SIR, . . . . .

I AM justified, therefore, in disclaiming as *uncandid* and *illegitimate* the *consequences* which you deduce from my opinions. I expressly guarded against these consequences. Without involving myself in any contradictions, I can disclaim them. I shall now prove that the same *uncandid and unfair arts* would involve many of *your principles* in odium, and fix on you consequences of your opinions which you will doubtless abhor and disclaim.

You take insulated sentences from my books; and without permitting other passages to explain or modify them, deduce obnoxious consequences from them.

Let this method be applied to many of your own principles and assertions. Let us suppose some ingenious sophist resolves to dispute Dr. Mason's pretensions to superiority in the arts of plausible but false deduction, of blackening opinions that they may be "urged over the precipice." He opens the Christian's Magazine, and thus breaks a lance with its giant editor.

According to Dr. M. the visible church on earth is the

"nursery of the church in heaven."* Now, the *ministry* and *ordinances* are the only external means by which the visible church "nurses" men for heaven. Therefore the *ministry* and *ordinances* of the visible church "nurse" men for heaven. And as divine grace "can do no more," it follows, that *Dr. M. places the ministry and ordinances on a level with divine grace* in the "article" of "nursing" men for heaven.

Again. Dr. M. being judge, "habitual disobedience to any of the known commands of Christ," to any law of God, to any thing which he hath prescribed, "excludes from the kingdom of heaven."† But according to Dr. M. "Presbyterial government," in which there is "perfect equality of rank among ministers," is the "law of God's house;"‡ it is the "*true* and *only* government which the Lord Jesus Christ hath prescribed in his word."§ Therefore *habitual disobedience to Presbyterian government excludes from the kingdom of heaven!!* And, of course, Dr. M. makes *obedience to Presbyterian government* "the *hinging point* of salvation." He rushes, with his eyes open, into the very crime for which he denounces "Mr. H. and his compeers." Unless he "flinch from the consequences of his own doctrine," he cannot even take his choice between "*contradiction* and *crime*." For, if habitual disobedience to Presbyterian government excludes from the kingdom of heaven, obedience to this government is made by Dr. M. "the hinging point of salvation;" and thus he *contradicts* his own declaration, that this point is "faith in the Lord Jesus."‖ And as Dr. M. maintains that habitual disobedience to Presbyterian government (which, according to him, is a "known command" of Christ) "excludes from the kingdom of heaven;"

* Christian's Magazine, introduction, p. 9.

† Christian's Magazine; p. 100.

‡ Christian's Magazine, introduction, p. 12, 13.

§ Constitution and Standards of the Associate-Reformed Church, p 475.

‖ Christian's Magazine, p. 98.

and as rejection of Christ can do more, therefore *Dr. M. makes disobedience to Presbyterian government equally criminal with rejection of the Lord Jesus!!* He is guilty of the *crime* of *degrading the merits of the Lord Jesus to a level with a point of external order, obedience to Presbyterian government;* for he annexes the same penalty to the rejection of both—*exclusion from the kingdom of heaven.*

And, further, as according to Dr. M. "habitual disobedience" to Presbyterial government—which he maintains is a "known command of Christ"—"excludes from the kingdom of heaven;" therefore he excludes from heaven Episcopalians, Congregationalists, Independents, Methodists, Baptists, Quakers, all of whom *habitually disobey Presbyterian government!!* "The alternative, then, is" PRESBYTERIANISM "or PERDITION!!" No, no, Dr. M will indignantly exclaim, I allow that "there are sins both of *ignorance* and *infirmity*, which consist with a gracious state." And pray, did not Mr. H. make the same concession when he declared that sins of "*unavoidable ignorance and involuntary error*" would not be punished, and, of course, consist with a gracious state? What is involuntary error but a sin of infirmity? "Measuring," therefore, to Dr. M.'s assertions the same measure which he meted to the assertions of Mr. H. and his "fellows;" it results that Episcopalians and others who renounce the divine institution of Presbytcrian government, are excluded from the kingdom of heaven. Dr. M. indeed, "softens this sweeping sentence of proscription, by representing it as not inconsistent with that charity which extends mercy to all" who sin through *ignorance* or *infirmity*. But "as there are few districts where this question can be agitated" without Presbyterians, or their ministers, or their writings, "the error" in rejecting Presbyterian government "must almost always be *wilful*." And, besides, Episcopalians and others "have no ground for this very precarious mercy but the charity" of Dr. M. "and his brethren." And surely "he is a fool" who would run the risk of being excluded from

the kingdom of heaven by rejecting Presbyterian government "on the credit of the charity" of Dr. M. and the Christian's Magazine. The very reasoning, the very language by which Dr. M. endeavours* to render odious Mr. H.'s principles, blackens his own.

Far be it from me to impute to you the conclusions to which your able competitor in the arts of sophistical reasoning would drag you. But I must declare, that the above obnoxious consequences are deduced from insulated expressions and sentences of your writings, by reasoning equally fair and legitimate with that by which you deduce, from insulated expressions and sentences of my books, the obnoxious opinions which you impute to me. *The weapons which you have aimed against me recoil upon yourself.*

It will require the exercise of much more moderation and candour than you have displayed, to reduce your principles and reasonings into an harmonious system. The object of the essay on "the visible church," is to impress on Christians the important doctrines—that there is an "external visible church;" that this church is "the house of the Lord;"† that this church has a "*visible ministry*, *visible worship*, *visible sacraments*;"‡ that to this visible church (and of course through its *visible ministry* and *sacraments*) "the Lord added such as are saved;"§ for in this "public visible society which God has appropriated to himself—his name is known, and his mercies vouchsafed:"‖ in the words of the Presbyterian confession of faith, there is "ordinarily out of this church no possibility of salvation." Now, it would be difficult to prove that I have laid greater stress on *external order* than the foregoing language will warrant. Yet, when I turn to your "review of the Essays on Episcopacy," I find that I am condemned for laying greater stress upon external order than is laid upon it in the word of God. And all the divine institutions you involve in one single principle, *faith*.

* Christian's Magazine, p. 94, 95. † p. 54. ‡ p. 71. § p. 62. ‖ p. 72.

Again. In the essay on the visible church we are repeatedly told that this church is but ONE.* Its *visible unity* is particularly insisted on. It is spoken of in the language of scripture as the "body of Christ;" to which, of course, we must conclude, that, "*ordinarily*," all must be united, who would partake of the saving influence of its divine head. Nay, we are told that to the church "God hath given his ordinances"—"the MEANS OF SALVATION."† And, consequently, there is indeed very good cause why the writers of the New Testament should "argue against *schism*."‡ Whereas, on the principles advanced in the "review of the Essays on Episcopacy," *schism* is only a name, "*vox et preterea nihil*, mere noise," a scare-crow to "disquiet timid consciences." On your principles the single act of faith unites the Christian so effectually to Christ, that he can *never finally fall away*. Of what consequence then is "the visible church," its "external ordinances," its "means of salvation?" For Dr. M. being judge, faith in the testimony of God does not depend on "going through the gate of Episcopacy," nor, for the same reason, through any other gate of *external order;* and faith alone infallibly saves us. Where then is the guilt or danger of schism, of separation from the "external ordinances" and the "visible ministry" of the church? While true believers have faith, they are united to Christ. And they may, therefore, divide and divide the "body of Christ" without end; may split into innumerable sects and parties; may, in fact, lay aside the "ministry and ordinances" appointed and commanded by Christ himself as "means of salvation;" and yet, if they only have faith—all is well—for faith is "the hinging point of salvation:" the inquiry, "whether a man shall go to heaven or to hell," is "fixed to this point" only, "whether he was a believer in the Lord Jesus!" On your principles faith is entirely unconnected with "external order," and faith alone is essential to salvation. You argue indeed precisely as one who

* Christian's Magazine, p. 63, 70. † p. 71. ‡ p. 61.

insists that there is no visible church would wish you to argue. For if a correct definition of the church be, that it is "the whole body of believers;" and if, in order to become a believer, it is not necessary to go through any gate of *external order;* if, of course, faith simply and alone admits into the church, a *visible ministry* and *sacraments* are not necessarily connected with *the church.* It follows, *there is no visible church.* A single "dash of your pen" has thus demolished *the visible church,* consigned to contempt its *ministry,* its *ordinances,* its *visible unity,* and made that heinous crime *schism* but an "empty name."

The reasoning in the "essay on the visible church," is founded on the principle, that the "visible church is in *substance* the same under both Testaments. The New Testament Church is the *very same* great society which God *formerly* erected for the praise of his glory, and has caused to pass under a new form of dispensation."* Of course, we may conclude that the "visible ministry" and "visible sacraments"† of this *new* and more perfect dispensation, are not less glorious, nor less important, nor less obligatory than those of the *old* dispensation. Under the Old Testament dispensation they "perished," who, like "Korah," "gainsayed," rebelled against the Jewish priesthood. But under the new dispensation, though the Apostle still speaks of those who perish "in the gainsaying of Korah,"‡ your reasoning will sanction the conclusion, that "rejection of the ministry" does not affect the eternal destiny of the offender—for "*faith* alone is the hinging point of salvation." Communion with the church under the Old Testament was the *mean* and *pledge* to the believing Jews of their being in a *covenant* state; and this communion was maintained by communion with the priesthood. And yet under the New Testament dispensation it would appear, according to your principles, that faith alone, effectually, and finally, and unchangeably, and independently of all *external order,* brings men into *covenant* with God. For

* Christian's Magazine, p. 72. † p. 71. ‡ Jude.

faith alone, as opposed to external order, you declare, is "the hinging point of salvation." Of course, if a man be united to Christ by faith, it does not affect his salvation whether he be in the church or out of it; whether he submit to a ministry of divine appointment, or one only of human invention; or whether in fact he submit to "the visible ministry and ordinances of Christ," or reject them all as mere "beggarly elements," unnecessary to genuine faith, or the saving operations of the spirit. Your principle is indeed that corner-stone of Calvinism, that the salvation of believers depends solely on the unconditional *decree of God;* of an interest in which decree, faith is the sole and unfailing assurance. And this principle, I am bold to say, will drive its defenders, "if closely followed up," through the Fanatical and Antinomian "camps," into *fatalism* itself; into making God the author of sin, and seating a blind and cruel destiny on that throne which now beams forth unutterable holiness and mercy.*

I am aware that you qualify your position, that faith alone is essential to salvation, by the assertion, that "habitual disobedience to any of the divine commands excludes from the kingdom of heaven." But how is this to be reconciled with the doctrine that "faith is the hinging point of salvation?" For surely whatever *excludes* from *the kingdom of heaven*, is the hinging point of salvation. And whatever falls under the denomination of "habitual disobedience to a divine command," let that command respect *external order*, or matters of *doctrine*, becomes then as much the hinging point of salvation as faith is. I shrewdly suspect, sir, that the more you "stir these troubled waters," "confusion will become worse confounded." If you undervalue external order, you are frowned upon by the palpable declarations of the Bible, and of all the standards of doctrine of the Pres-

* The language which I here use is justified by your's, p. 25 of the Christian's Magazine.

byterian churches. And if you consider obedience to external order (though it be commanded by God) as a condition of salvation, you are in danger of encroaching on the Calvinistic principle, that faith, as the infallible testimony of our being the objects of the decree of everlasting election, is the point on which our salvation turns.

The truth is, the divine commands are all obligatory. All comparison of the relative importance or obligation of these commands, in order to determine which we may with impunity neglect or violate, is criminal and impious. Let me direct your attention to the language of one, who, though a *prelate* of the Church of England, is, I suspect, a favourite writer with you. Bishop BUTLER, in his "Analogy,"* thus settles the point of the comparative obligation of the commands of God. "Our obligations to obey *all* God's commands whatever are absolute and *indispensable*,† and commands merely positive, admitted to be from him, lay us under a moral obligation to obey them—an obligation moral in the strictest and most proper sense." Yes, sir, "he who keepeth the whole law, and yet" habitually and wilfully "offends in one point, he is guilty of all." And were the "whole world" laid at my feet, it should not tempt me to run the hazard of that believer, however much he may boast of the assurance of his faith, who *habitually* and *wilfully* violates "one of the least commandments" of his divine Lord; even though it be that *external order* which you are so confident is not the hinging point of salvation.

* P. 208, Boston edition.

† Observe, sir, this acute and accurate reasoner uses the term *indispensable* in the same sense in which I apply it in the Companion for the Altar.

## LETTER VIII.

SIR,

IT is a most grievous offence to you that the advocates of Episcopacy "unchurch" those who reject it, and leave them to "uncovenanted mercy." This "dreadful excommunication" produces the most awful effects. Your imagination fires—your bosom swells—the voice of thunder proclaims—Mr. H. and his compeers make "the only alternative, EPISCOPACY or PERDITION"—"The hair stands up like quills upon the fretful porcupine"—"The warm blood is frozen at its fountain." I am persuaded that the candid reader, who has impartially considered my defence against these charges, in the preceding pages, will smile when he sees you so violently agitated at a phantom which possesses no terrors but what your vivid imagination has thrown around it. In fact, sir, I deny that in an *unqualified* sense, I have unchurched *non-Episcopalians*. What says the "Companion for the Altar?" "To experience the *full and exalted efficacy* of the sacraments, we must receive them from a valid authority."* What says the Companion for the Festivals and Fasts? "The Church of Christ is a visible institution. It is to be known by its *priesthood*, which, as we have seen, was established by Christ and his apostles under the three orders of *Bishops*, *Presbyters*, and *Deacons;* by its *doctrine*, and by its *sacraments*. Where these are as Christ ordained them, there is the Church of Christ; where these, or any of them, are wanting, there the church is not; at least, *not in a sound and perfect state*."† As far as any particular church corrupts the doctrine and sacraments, or renounces the duly authorized ministry of Christ's Church, so far she ceases to be the CHURCH "in a *sound* and *perfect* state." Nor do I

* Companion for the Altar, p. 203.

† Companion for the Festivals and Fasts, p. 56 and 57.

leave non-Episcopalians in any other sense to "uncovenanted mercy," than you do those who, though they have faith in Christ, do not deem it necessary to be baptized, or to receive the Lord's supper. For as they reject those sacraments which (yourself being judge) are not merely the "signs," but the "seals of the covenant of grace," of "ingrafting into Christ," of all the "benefits of Christ's sacrifice,"* they surely cannot be said to be regularly and fully "within the covenant," "ingrafted into Christ," or entitled to the "benefits of his sacrifice."

My business now shall be to show that I do not proceed as far in this business of unchurching as my accuser. You warmly recommend Mr. M'Leod's Catechism. It would be an affront to suppose that you have not attentively weighed the principles in that book; and after this solemn examination, to recommend them as reviewer, *ex cathedra*, is to make them your own. Let us now see how far your principles "unchurch" Christians, and leave them to "uncovenanted mercy."

1. Mr. M'L. and yourself *unchurch the* QUAKERS. For you make "a legitimate ministry" one of the characteristics of the TRUE church;"† and as the Quakers certainly have not what you consider a legitimate ministry, they are not of the true church.

2. Mr. M'L. and yourself *unchurch* EPISCOPALIANS. You call a legitimate ministry "ecclesiastical officers ordained according to Christ's appointment."‡ Now, as you consider the power of the Bishop in ordination an "usurpation" of course, those ministers who are Episcopally ordained are not "ordained according to Christ's appointment;" consequently, are not *legitimate ministers:* and as "a legitimate ministry is one of the characteristics of the true church," *you make the Episcopal Church not the true church.*

* Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Churches, chap. XXV. sec. 1. 28, 1. 29.

† Ecclesiastical Catechism, p. 8, Q. 18. ‡ p. 8, 20.

Mr. M'L. and yourself maintain, (Eccles. Catec. p. 29. Q. 67) "that a person who is *not ordained by a Presbytery* has no right to be received as a minister of Christ: his administration of ordinances is invalid: no divine blessing is promised upon his labours: it is rebellion against the head of the church to support him in his pretensions: Christ has excluded him in his providence from admission through the ordinary door: and if he has no evidence of miraculous power to testify his extraordinary mission, he is an impostor." What is this but to unchurch Episcopalians, to pronounce their ministers "impostors," and their ordinances "invalid?" For DEACONS, one of the orders of Episcopal ministers, are not "ordained by a Presbytery," but by the *Bishop*, who alone lays on his hands. An Episcopal Deacon, therefore, (according to yourself and Mr. M'L.) is "an impostor"—his administration of baptism "invalid"—"no divine blessing is promised on his labours" of *preaching:* and Episcopalians are guilty of "*rebellion* against the head of the church in supporting him in his pretensions!" In the same predicament stand *Episcopal* PRESBYTERS: for they are ordained by *the Bishop*. The associating of the *Presbyters* with him in the laying on of hands is only *an ecclesiastical regulation*, to denote the *concurrence* of the Presbyters, and to guard the exercise of the Episcopal power of ordination.* This regulation was introduced into

* "Doth it hereupon follow that the power of ordination was not principally and originally in the Bishop? Our Saviour hath said unto his Apostles, *With me ye shall sit and judge the twelve tribes of Israel;* yet we know that to him alone it belongeth to judge the world, and that to him all judgment is given. The association of Presbyters is no sufficient proof that the power of ordination was in them, but rather that it never was in them we may hereby understand; for that no man is able to show either Deacon or Presbyter ordained by Presbyters only, and his ordination accounted lawful in any ancient part of the church; everywhere examples being found both of Deacons and Presbyters ordained by Bishops alone oftentimes, neither even in that respect thought insufficient." Hooker. Ecclesiastical Polity, book vii. sect. 6.

the *Western* church only by a canon of the fourth century; the Eastern church having to this day uniformly retained the mode which before prevailed, of "the laying on of the hands" of the *Bishop* alone. An ordination by the laying on of the hands of the Bishop, Episcopalians consider as *valid*, though not according to *ecclesiastical usage*. The third order of Episcopal ministers, BISHOPS, being "not ordained by a Presbytery," but by *Bishops*, whose powers are expressly called "usurpations," stand in the predicament with the other two orders. Thus, then, Episcopal ministers, being "not ordained by a *Presbytery*," have "no right to be received as *ministers of Christ:* their administration of ordinances is *invalid:* no divine blessing is promised upon their labours:" Episcopalians are guilty of "*rebellion* against the head of the church in supporting them in their pretensions:" and as they have "no evidence of miraculous powers to testify their *extraordinary* mission, they are IMPOSTORS."

3. Mr. M'L. and yourself unchurch the ROMAN CATHOLIC and the GREEK CHURCH. It would be wasting time to prove that as they have none of your characteristics of *the true church*, neither "sound doctrine, a legitimate ministry, nor a proper use of the sacraments,"* they are richly deserving of being viewed as "synagogues of Satan!"

4. But what is most astonishing (I tremble while I record it,) Mr. M'L. and yourself *unchurch* the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF SCOTLAND! You make "the discharge of the duties of their offices according to Christ's direction,"† an essential characteristic of that "legitimate ministry" which is necessary to "*the true church.*" And it is notorious that the fundamental cause of the separation of the sects of Seceders from whom you and Mr. M'L. are descended, (and the principles of which separation you still sacredly maintain) is, that the "ministry," the "ecclesiastical officers" of the

* Ecclesiastical Catechism, p. 8–18.

† Ecclesiastical Catechism, p. 8–20.

Church of Scotland, did not "discharge the duties of their office agreeably to the *direction of Christ*." Of course, they are not a legitimate ministry; and, therefore, *the Church of Scotland is not the true church!*

5. But, alas! it has fallen to my unhappy lot to record, that "in the beginning of the 19th century,"* two distinguished divines have "committed to writing," a *sentence of excision on the whole* VISIBLE CHURCH! Mr. M'L. and yourself maintain that "the characteristics of the TRUE CHURCH, are sound doctrine, a legitimate ministry, and the proper use of the sacraments." Now there is no church (Mr. M'L. being judge) † which is perfectly "sound in doctrine." There is no church, the ministry of which discharge their office in all respects, "agreeably to Christ's direction;" which it is necessary they should do, in order to be "a legitimate ministry."‡ There is no church, whose ministry administer the sacraments in all respects "in the *true spirit* of the institution;" which is necessary to "the proper use of the sacraments."§ And as all these Mr. M'L. and yourself make necessary to "THE TRUE CHURCH, it follows, that *there is no true church on earth!!!* Mr. M'L. and Dr. M. by "a single dash of the pen," blot out that "church," against which its divine founder promised "the gates of hell should not prevail." It is true, you soften "this sweeping sentence" by "some reliefs," and some "concessions."‖ But they are "not worth accepting," for they are "in direct repugnance" to your definitions of the true church, and only show that "you flinch from the consequences of your doctrine." God forbid that I should believe you serious in this "dreadful excommunication." But I insist that a specimen of fairer deduction from acknowledged premises does not grace any page of the "review of the Essays on Episcopacy."

* I borrow these words from Mr. M'L. Ecclesiastical Catechism, p. 113.
† Ecclesiastical Catechism, p. 7–15. ‡ p. 8–20. § p. 9–21.
‖ I have recourse again to your own language.

The fact is, that Mr. M'L. applies to the "*true* church" the characteristics of a *sound and perfect church*.* I really think you should call Mr. M'L. to an account for the dilemma in which he has involved both you and himself through want of precision in the use of terms. I can give you another specimen of this gentleman's accuracy in his definitions. Christians in general have hitherto supposed that baptism was the "sacrament ordained by Jesus Christ for the *solemn admission* of the party baptised into the visible church."† But Mr. M'L. has found out that the sacraments are to be administered only "to regularly received members of the church;"‡ that is, baptism, which is one of the sacraments, and by which a person becomes a regularly received member of the church," is not to be administered to him until he is a "regularly received member!!" It is really curious to observe Mr. M'L.'s application of scripture. For example, he proves that the "Shorter Catechism, compiled by the Westminster Assembly of Divines, is the most complete and comprehensive summary of the doctrines of the gospel," from the text, 2 Tim. i. 13. "Hold fast the form of sound words."§ He proves that "the form of church government is wisely adapted to every state of the church," from the text, Rev. i. 20. "The mystery of the seven stars, which thou sawest in my right hand, and the seven golden candlesticks. The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches; and the seven candlesticks which thou sawest are the seven churches."‖ He proves that "Presbyterial order is divinely appointed for the perfecting of the saints, and all are bound to submit to it," from the text, Rev. iii.

* Mr. M'L.'s definition of a *true church*, which indeed proves there is not a *true church* on earth, appears not only in his Ecclesiastical Catechism, but in the standards of the church of which he is a minister. See "Reformation Principles," part ii. chap. xx. sect. 7.

† Presbyterian Confession of Faith, chap. xxviii. 1.

‡ Ecclesiastical Catechism, p. 9.

§ Ecclesiastical Catechism, p. 8. ‖ p. 14.

22. "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches."* He proves the "reasonableness and excellency of the Presbyterian constitution of church government," from the text, Ezek. xliii. 12. "The whole limit thereof round about shall be holy. Behold, this is the law of the house."† And, wonderful discovery! he proves that the deacon's office "respects only temporal affairs," from the text, Rom. xii. 8. "He that giveth, let him do it with simplicity."‡ Really, I should not despair that Mr. M'L. would be able satisfactorily to prove from scripture, what all Lord Peter's *bulls* have hitherto failed to establish, that "a twelve-penny leaf is a shoulder of mutton!" Yet this is the gentleman who has kindly undertaken to instruct us, poor simple Americans, in the principles of ecclesiastical government; and who has written in the most contemptuous manner of the principles and institutions of the Episcopal Church.

You maintain that faith alone is the condition of salvation, and that it is an abominable error to rank participation of the ordinances by the hands of Christ's authorized ministers among the appointed conditions of salvation.

From the references which I have occasionally made in the preceding pages to the Presbyterian confessions of faith, I think it must be evident that I do not lay any greater stress on *external order*, on communion with the church through its ministry and ordinances, than the standards and confessions of faith of the Presbyterian churches will warrant.

Do I maintain that (except in cases of unavoidable ignorance or involuntary error) it is only by communion with the visible church, that we can obtain a title to the blessings of salvation? I open the confessions of faith of the Presbyterian churches, and find them maintaining the same doctrine. "The visible church,"—is the *kingdom* of the Lord Jesus Christ, the *house* and *family of God*, out of which there is

* p. 31. † p. 87. ‡ p. 35.

no ordinary *possibility of salvation.*"* I shield myself under your great master Calvin, who declares, "that departing from the church *is a denying of God and Christ.*"†

Do I maintain that communion with the visible church can only be maintained by the participation of the sacraments from the hands of duly authorized ministers? I only avow Presbyterian doctrine. On Presbyterian principles a *ministry* and *ordinances* are essential to the *visible church.* "Unto this Catholic *visible* church (say the Presbyterian confessions of faith) Christ hath given the *ministry*, oracles and *ordinances* of God for the *gathering* and *perfecting* of the saints in this life, to the end of the world; and doth by his own *presence* and *spirit*, according to his promise, make them *effectual thereunto.*"‡ Baptism and the Lord's supper are "holy *signs and seals* of the *covenant* of grace," appointed by Christ for our "solemn admission into the Church," and for "confirming and sealing our interest in him;" and they are not to be "dispensed by any but by a minister of the word, lawfully ordained."§ The great reformer, Calvin, holds the same language—"*Forgiveness of sins* is a benefit so *proper* to the *church*, that we cannot *otherwise enjoy it*, but if we abide in the *communion* thereof. It is *distributed* unto us by the *ministers and pastors*, either by preaching the gospel, or by ministering of the sacraments. Wherefore let every one of us think this to be his duty, *no where else* to seek *forgiveness of sins*, than *where* the Lord hath left it."‖ Is it possible to lay greater stress on external order than Calvin does, who declares "neither the light and heat of the sun, nor meat and drink, are so necessary to nourish and sustain this present life, as the *office of the apostles and pastors* is

* Presbyterian Confession of Faith, chap. xxv. 2.
† Calvin's Institutes, book iv. chap. i. sect. 10.
‡ Prysbyterian Confession of Faith, chap. xxv. 3.
§ Presbyterian Confession of Faith, chap. xxvii. xxviii. xxix.
‖ Calvin's Institutes, book iv. chap. i. sect. 22.

necessary to *preserve* the church."* Would any person have believed it possible, that a disciple of Calvin, a minister who holds the sentiments above quoted from the Presbyterian confession of faith, would impeach me with laying an undue stress upon "external order?" Would any person have believed it possible, that a minister who holds these sentiments, who even makes the comfort which a believer takes in his faith to depend upon "the offer of reconciliation" being "made to him by the mouth of ministers *having commission to that effect*,"† should yet impeach me for insisting on "soundness in external order," as one of the conditions of salvation? Yes, sir, you are the man! But, would you shield from guilt any of your own people, however warm and strong his faith, who, emboldened by your declamation against me for insisting on the ministry and ordinances as conditions of salvation, should reject them, as derogating from the all-sufficiency of the merits of Christ, and the grace of the Holy Spirit? Would you not urge on his conscience that he was hazarding his salvation, by impiously contemning the divine "seals of the covenant," those "*ordinances* in which the *covenant* is dispensed,"‡ and by thus rejecting *covenanted* mercy? Now, sir, does not this reasoning involve the very principle for which you so bitterly condemn me—*confining covenanted mercy to the ministry and ordinances appointed by Christ?* My confining the ministry and ordinances appointed by Christ to the Episcopal ministry and ordinances, makes no difference as to the *principle* involved, and which you so loudly condemn. This *principle* is, *the making of the blessings of salvation dependent on "external order."* The criminality of this principle, which, according to you, places "external order on a level with the merits of

* Calvin's Institutes, book iv. chap. iii. sect. 2.

† Constitution of the Associate-Reformed Church, p. 603. "Sum and substance of saving knowledge,' originally set forth by the Westminster "Assembly of Divines."

‡ Presbyterian Confession of Faith, chap. vii. 6.

Christ in the article of acceptance before God," is the same whether this "external order" be "Episcopal, or Presbyterian, or Independent."* Really, sir, in my humble judgment, candour, consistency, and regard for the sacred principles of your own church, should make you blush whenever you open a page of your "review of the Essays on Episcopacy." Pardon me if I assert that it is "*vox et preterea nihil*, mere noise, and need give no disquiet to the most timid"† Churchman, nor shake him a moment from his principles. I shall be justified in addressing to you remarks similar in spirit to those with which you seek to rouse the conscience of Dr. Nott. Your talents and acquirements, which are certainly of no ordinary kind, and, above all, your sacred character should lead you to spurn the ignoble arts of crushing a cause which you oppose, by blackening it with *consequences* disclaimed by its advocates, and not fairly deducible from its principles. There is not an observation by which you attempt to prejudge me, which may not be directed with equal force against your own principles. The Quaker, who on your principles does not possess that ministry and those ordinances which are the "seals of the covenant," and by which "it is dispensed," may exclaim—What! will "no 'repentance toward God;' no 'faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ;' no conformity to his image; no zeal for his glory, be of any avail?"‡ Will the "simple fact of my separation from the authorized, that is to say," Dr. M.'s "priesthood, mar my religion, and render it stark naught?" Does then Dr. M. make, for every Quaker, however humble, pious, and holy his faith, the only alternative, *submission to a hireling priesthood or* PERDITION!! "Alas! alas! *pudet! pudet!*" The mode you pursue will exalt the triumphs of the infidel; will enable him to push some insulated doctrine of the gospel to the *extreme*, and then to exclaim, These are "positions of deep-toned horror!"

When I see you, instead of dispassionately investigating

* Christian's Magazine, p. 98. † p. 101. ‡ p. 94.

my principles, urge against me charges which may be all made to recoil upon your own, I am "held in suspense between the gaze of astonishment and the swell of indignation." May not such conduct with great propriety be considered as evidence of the weakness of your cause? When the most potent champion of a cause resorts to such disingenuous arts, and, at the *outset*, attempts to rouse prejudice and passion, there is at least strong presumption that the cause is a weak one. Let then this system of *denunciation*, of *illegitimate deduction*, be renounced. Test my principles by SCRIPTURE, as elucidated and supported by ANTIQUITY. Wrest from my superstructure this sacred foundation, and I will join with you in chaunting hallelujahs to its downfall. But while the venerable edifice of Episcopacy rests its solid base on the ROCK OF AGES, it will proudly defy the tempests of invective and denunciation which roll against its lofty battlements.

---

## LETTER IX.

SIR,

To the *law* and to the *testimony*, to the word of God, and to the testimony of the Apostolic and primitive age, let us then bring the claims of Episcopacy. You affect indeed to consider Presbyterianism as coming down to us with the awful and venerable sanction of ages; while the *upstart* pretensions of Episcopacy are to be "hunted" down as equally *novel* and "arrogant." This is an assurance which would qualify a man for the task of proving that the books of the New Testament are forgeries of recent ages. The very same testimonies, which establish that the books of the New Testament are genuine and authentic, determine the fact of the Apostolic institution and universal reception of Episcopacy.* This is acknowledged by the learned STILLING-

* This fact is proved by the learned Leslie, the author of that incompa-

FLEET, the auther of the "Irenicum," to which the Christian's Magazine will probably be indebted for many of its arguments against Episcopacy. This book was written by *Stillingfleet* as the early age of twenty-four years, in the vain hope of *healing* the divisions on the subject of church order, by a system of mutual concession. Accordingly he labours to refute the opinion, that there is any precise form of church government, extending to all matters of discipline, rites, and ceremonies, laid down in scripture. He thus bears as hard on those who maintain that *Presbyterian government*, in all its parts, is established in scripture, as he does on those who maintain the same concerning Episcopal government. Presbyterian writers are very fond of employing the arguments which he uses against their opponents, while they pay no respect to those which he urges against themselves. It is certain that Stillingfleet retracted all those opinions in his "*Irenicum*," which militated against the *Apostolic institution of Bishops*. He apologizes for this work in his "Preface" to the "Unreasonableness of Separation." "Will you not allow," says he, "one single person who happened to write about these matters when he was *very young*, in *twenty years* time of the most busy and thoughtful part of his life, to *see reason to alter his judgment*?" In a sermon which was the result of his most mature judgment and examination, we find him declaring, "I cannot find any argument of force in the New Testament to prove that *ever* the Christian churches were under the sole government of *Presbyters*." "This *succession* was not in mere *presidency of order*, but the *Bishops* succeeded the Apostles in the *government* over those churches." "There is as great reason to believe the Apostolical *succession* to be of *divine institution*,

rable tract, the "Short Method with the Deists," in his treatises on Episcopacy, published in the "Scholar Armed." And an able writer of our own country, in the Churchman's Monthly Magazine for November, 1806, has taken up the primitive evidence for the divine authority of the books of the New Testament, and proved that the very same evidence supports Episcopacy.

as the *canon of scripture*, or the observation of the Lord's day." *

Episcopacy has the sanction of *ancient*, *universal* usage; while Presbyterianism sprang up but a few centuries ago. At the period of the Reformation, EPISCOPACY was the *universally acknowledged* government. PRESBYTERIANISM was looked upon as an upstart, utterly destitute of all pretensions to *antiquity;* insomuch that we find Hooker declaring, "A very strange thing, sure it were, that such a discipline (Presbyterianism) as you speak of, should be taught by Christ and his Apostles in the word of God, and *no church have found it out*, nor *received it*, till this *present time!*" † Accordingly we find Hooker repeating the bold challenge, "We require you to find out but *one church upon the face of the whole earth*, that hath been ordered by your discipline, or hath not been ordered by ours, that is to say, by *Episcopal regiment*, since the time that the *blessed Apostles were here conversant.*" ‡

What then is the state of the case? An order of ministers, superior to Presbyters and Deacons, and styled Bishops, possess the power of ordination, and the supreme power of governing the church. We look back a very few centuries, and find them in universal possession of these powers, of which indeed they have been stripped but in only a very few Christian churches. They hold their rights therefore by *prescription, by long immemorial usage.* This is a title which has peculiar claims to the respect and obedience of all friends to institutions sanctioned by the wisdom of ages. You, of all others, are bound to respect it. For you would scorn being ranked among those who are "given to change," and who desire to "remove the *ancient landmarks.*"—Poh—you will say—the Pope of Rome supports his corrupt throne by the same plea, *long immemorial usage.* But stop, sir, if you please, not so fast. No Protestant will admit this plea of

* Sermon preached by Stillingfleet at an ordination at St. Paul's, 1684.
† *Preface* to Ecclesiastical Polity, sect. 4. ‡ Sect. 4.

popery. We can fix within a certain period the commencement of the reign of *antichrist*. A distinguished divine, whose authority I think you will not dispute, when speaking of the *commencement* of the reign of antichrist, declares, "The *earliest period* which can be suggested is the year 325."* Yes, sir, prior to that period Protestants are able to disprove, by the most abundant and unequivocal testimonies from primitive writers, the false pretensions of the Papal power. And can you, within this period, produce any testimony against Episcopacy? No, sir; the challenge of Hooker may be here repeated—"Produce one church that was not governed by Episcopal regiment," and we give up our cause. Where, then, is the parallel between Episcopacy and Popery? The Pope of Rome did not arrive to "full stature" until the fourth, and the generality of Protestants maintain, on stronger evidence, until the seventh century.† But the opponents of Episcopacy are compelled to trace it back to the *Apostolic age*;‡ and even then to rest the change from Presbyterianism to Episcopacy on mere *conjecture*. In vain they seek for explicit testimony, for express record of so extraordinary a fact. If Episcopacy be an usurpation, how happens it that the discovery has never been made until within a very late period?

But against the supposition that the powers which Bishops exercise by long and immemorial usage, were originally an usurpation, there is an argument, which even with every candid Presbyterian must be conclusive. If Episcopacy were an usurpation; if the power of the Bishops, like that of the Pope, were "anti-Christian and unscriptural," would not the illustrious Reformers have denounced Episcopacy with as much zeal as they did Popery? To suppose that they would not, is to impeach at once their talents and their

* The Rev. Dr. Livingston, in his Missionary Sermon, p. 58.

† "The *rise* of *antichrist* is to be dated in the sixth year of the seventh century." So says Mr. M'L. in his "Reformation Principles," p. 42.

‡ *Blondel*, one of the most learned opponents of Episcopacy, supposes that it took its rise about the year of our Lord 140.

sincerity. The *hierarchy, in its various modifications*, was an object of jealousy, of close, bold, and unrestrained investigation; and the primitive writers were faithfully explored in order to test its pretensions. If, under these circumstances, the Reformers,* while they denounced the Pope as "antichrist," the "man of sin," the "son of perdition," not only refrained from censuring Episcopacy, but spoke of such an Episcopacy as the Church of England possesses in the most respectful terms, I think, the conclusion is irresistible, that Popery and Episcopacy are not equally untenable, and that *Bishops* may still claim for their power, *prescription, long and immemorial usage.*

The fact is remarkable and indisputable, that the great Reformers, CALVIN, BEZA, and other divines of the Reformed churches on the continent of Europe, in opposing the hierarchy, opposed only the *corrupt* hierarchy of the Church of Rome; approved in the strongest language of a *primitive Episcopacy, such as the Church of England possessed;* and lamented the imperious circumstances which deprived them of it. CALVIN, in his book concerning the "necessity of reforming the church," makes a declaration which has frequently been adduced: "*If they would give us* such an hierarchy, in which the *Bishops* should so excel, as that they did not refuse to be subject to Christ," &c. &c. "then I will confess that they are worthy of all ANATHEMAS, if any such shall be found, who will not reverence it, and submit themselves to it with the utmost obedience."† What strong lan-

* The Bishop here manifestly speaks of the *continental* "Reformers." —EDITOR.

† "Talem nobis *hierarchiam* si exhibeant, in qua sic emineant Episcopi ut Christo subesse non recusent, ut ab illo tanquam unico capite pendeant, et ad ipsum referantur; in qua sic inter se fraternam societatem colant, ut non alio nodo quam ejus veritate sint colligati, tum vero nullo non *anathemate* dignos fateor, si qui erunt, qui non eam reverentur, summaque obedientia observent." This declaration of CALVIN has been often quoted. I have examined the tract *de necessitate, reformandæ ecclesiæ*, which is contained in a volume of the works of Calvin, published

guage is this? He could not get an Episcopacy but what was subject to the Pope of Rome. But, says he, "if they would give us an hierarchy subject to Christ alone," he not only professes a willingness to receive it, but denounces an "anathema" against all who should reject it. Nay, so firm appears his conviction, that such an Episcopacy was scriptural and primitive, that he expresses a doubt whether "any such should be found!"

The Episcopacy which CALVIN here recommends, could not be a Presbyterian or Parochial Episcopacy, in which all the ministers are on a level, and in which every pastor or bishop has the charge of only one congregation. The distinction of *superior* and *inferior* orders of ministers is always connected with a *hierarchy*, and by this term CALVIN distinguishes the Episcopacy he recommends. He is defending himself from the charge of being guilty of schism in departing from the hierarchy of the Church of Rome. And he does not justify this departure on the ground that the bishops of the Church of Rome were *diocesan*, or exercised authority over *churches* consisting of *several congregations* with their *ministers*, but that these bishops were not *subject to Christ* "If they would give us *such an hierarchy*, in which the *bishops should so excel*, as *not* to *refuse* to be *subject* to *Christ*," then he denounces an *anathema* against all who should reject it. The very expression, "in qua sic episcopi *emineant*," "in which the bishops should so *excel*," denotes that the *bishops* meant by Calvin, exercised *superior powers* over their brethren, and, of course, were not Presbyterian bishops. They were so to excel, so to be *superior*, as not to refuse subjection to Christ. Calvin also refers with approbation to the state of the church in the time of CYPRIAN, when the *bishops* certainly were *diocesan*, exercised power over *clergy and congregations*. CYPRIAN had several presbyters subject

by Beza, entitled, Joannis Calvini tractatus theologici omnes, in unum volumen certis classibus congesti, &c. The passage cited above is at the 69th page of the volume.

to him, and CORNELIUS, his contemporary, Bishop of Rome, had under him in the diocese of Rome, forty-six presbyters and seven deacons. It is incredible, also, that *Episcopacy* should *not* have been *diocesan* in the time of Cyprian; and yet that EUSEBIUS, who wrote his ecclesiastical history within less than half a century after the death of Cyprian, should trace the succession of *diocesan bishops* to the *Apostles*.

Surely Presbyterian writers who constantly and invariably apply the term HIERARCHY, as designating church government, solely to *diocesan Episcopacy*, in which there is "rank and subordination" of ministers, cannot consistently plead that Calvin, by this term, meant *Presbyterian or Parochial Episcopacy*, in which there is a perfect parity of ministers. I believe no instance can be produced where the term is applied to any sacred government or community in which there is not *distinction* and *subordination* of *sacred orders*.

The divines of the French Protestant Church understood Calvin as applying this term, *hierarchy*, to the *English Episcopacy*. This very passage is so understood and cited by M. DE L'ANGLE, minister of the French Church at Charenton, in a letter addressed to the Bishop of London—"Since the Church of England is a *true church* of our Lord; since her *worship* and *doctrines* are *pure*, and have nothing in them contrary to the word of God; and since that when the Reformation was there received, it was received together with *Episcopacy*, and with the establishment of the Liturgy and Ceremonies, which are there in use at this day; it is, without doubt, the duty of all the reformed in your realm, to keep themselves *inseparably united to that church*.—This was so much the opinion of our great and excellent CALVIN, that in his treatise *of the necessity of the Reformation*, he makes no difficulty to say, that if there should be any so unreasonable as to refuse the communion of a church that was pure in its worship and doctrine, and not to submit himself with respect to its government, under pretence that it had retained an *Episcopacy qualified as yours is;* there would be no cen-

sure nor rigour of discipline that ought not to be exercised upon them."*

Another divine of the French church, Mons. DAILLE, understands Calvin to the same effect—"CALVIN himself honoured all *Bishops that* were not subjects of the Pope, &c. such as were the PRELATES OF ENGLAND, CRANMER, Archbishop of Canterbury, HOOPER, and others.—We confess that the *foundation of their charge is good and lawful, established by the Apostles, according to the command of Christ*, in the churches which they founded."†

CALVIN disclaims that *equality* in the ministry which the Christian's Magazine maintains is the "law of God's house." In his comment on the text in Titus, "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou mightest ordain elders in every city," &c. he observes, "Hence we learn, that there *was not any equality* among the ministers of the church, but that *one* was *placed over* the rest in *authority* and *counsel*." CALVIN here acknowledges what the advocates of Episcopacy maintain, that Titus was the *head* and *supreme governor* of the church in Crete.

CALVIN indeed did not pretend that the Presbyterian form of government which he established at Geneva was primitive. In his epistle to *Cardinal Sadolet*, he says, "We deny not that we *want* a DISCIPLINE such as the *ancient church* had; but can they with justice accuse us of having overthrown the discipline of the church, who are the only men who have destroyed it from the foundation, and who, when we *endeavoured to restore the same*, have hitherto opposed that work? But as for *doctrine*, we are willing to be tried by the *ancient church*."‡

BEZA, the colleague, and afterwards the successor of Cal-

* This letter is annexed to Stillingfleet's "Unreasonableness of Separation." It was written in 1680.

† See Bingham's French Church's Apology for Church of England, annexed to the second volume of his works.

‡ Ad Sadoletum Responsio. Joan. Calv. Trac. p. 125

vin, in his treatise against Saravia, observes, "If there are any (which you shall hardly persuade me to believe) who reject the *whole order of Episcopacy*, God forbid that any man of a sound mind should assent to the madness of such men!" How far removed then, from insanity and madness, in the judgment of Beza, are those men who pronounce *the whole order of Episcopacy* to be "anti-Christian and unscriptural!" This order of Episcopacy was the Episcopacy possessed by the Church of England: for in the same treatise he styles it a "singular blessing," and prays that it may be "perpetual" to that church.

Videlius, a distinguished divine of the Church of *Geneva*, afterwards Professor of Divinity in the Reformed Church of *Holland*, who lived in the seventeenth century, maintains the genuineness of the Epistles of Ignatius, which bear such decided testimony to Episcopacy, and asserts, "that after the death of Linus and Cletus, *Clemens* was left alone; and retained the name of Bishop, both because he then survived all those who had been assistants of the Apostles; and also for that the *distinction of the names of bishop and presbyter was even then in force.*"* Videlius here testifies to *diocesan Episcopacy*, for he makes Clemens to be *alone* Bishop of Rome; and surely there must have been more than one congregation of Christians in that city. The learned Casaubon, a divine of the Church of *Geneva*, in the seventeenth century, observes concerning the Church of England, "that no church in the world came nearer to the form of the most flourishing *primitive church;* having observed a middle way betwixt those churches which have failed either by excess or defect."†

Let us pass on to the testimony of the *Reformed Church of Holland* in favour of Episcopacy, made by the famous Synod of Dort. At this Synod several of the bishops of England attended by invitation. In a tract which these

* Videl. Exer. 8. in Ign. epist. ad Marium, cap. iii.

† See Durel's View of the Reformed Churches, p. 296.

bishops published, they declare, "in our private converse with the most eminent of the ministry, we found many more ready to *deplore* than to defend their *own estate*, and *wished* rather than *hoped* to be made *like* the *flourishing* CHURCH OF ENGLAND." And when the British delegates "asserted publicly and openly in the Synod the *divine right of Episcopacy*, and appealed therein to the judgment of *antiquity*," the members of the Synod replied, "that they had a great respect and value for the good *order and discipline* of *the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND, and wished with all their hearts that the *same order* were observed and settled there; that they durst not, however, hope for such a happiness in the present state of affairs; but hoped that, though their *ability bore no proportion to their will*, God would assist them by his grace and favour, and that they would do all in their power towards it."* A famous divine of the same church, LE MOYNE, Professor of Divinity at *Leyden*, in Holland, in a letter addressed to the Bishop of London in 1680, not only defends Episcopacy, but expressly asserts that it had always subsisted throughout the universal church; "for the EPISCOPAL government, what is there in it that is dangerous?" &c. &c. "*For the space of fifteen hundred years, all the other churches of the world had no other kind of government.*"†

Equally decisive in favour of Episcopacy are the sentiments of divines of the *French Protestant Church*. They extol Episcopacy, and expressly plead necessity for departure from it. Mons. LE MOYNE, a Protestant minister of Roan, in France, in a letter written in the year 1661, and addressed to an English clergyman, thus extols Episcopacy —"Truly I believe not that it is possible to keep either peace or order in your church without preserving the *Epis-*

* This fact is also stated by Bishop HALL, who attended the Synod, in his *Divine Right of Episcopacy;* by *Collier*, in his Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. p. 717, &c. and by *Brandt*, in his History of the Reformation, vol. iii. p. 288.

† The letter is published at length in the appendix to Stillingfleet's "Unreasonableness of Separation."

*copal dignity.* And I confess that *I conceive not by what spirit they are led that oppose that government, and cry it down with such violence.* For I defy any man, whoever he be, to show me, if he can, any other order more *suitable with reason*, yea, or better *agreeing with holy scripture*, and of which God hath made more use for *the establishment of his truth, and the amplification of his kingdom.*"* The plea of *necessity* for departing from Episcopacy is expressly urged by another divine of the French Reformed Church, Mons. Du Bosc—"We acknowledge that this order hath signal advantages; and I think not that any of my brethren will contradict me, if I say that WELL-ORDERED EPISCOPACY *hath most important and considerable utilities which cannot be found in the* PRESBYTERIAN DISCIPLINE. If we have followed the *last* in our churches, it not for any aversion we have to the former; it is not because we hold Episcopacy to be contrary to the nature of the gospel, or because we think it less convenient for the good of the church, or less worthy of the condition of the true flocks of our Lord; but because it is NECESSITY *hath obliged us to it;* because Reformation having been begun in this kingdom by the people and by inferior churchmen, the places of Bishops remained filled with men of a contrary religion, so that we are *constrained* to content ourselves with ministers and elders as well as we could," &c.† The testimony of DAILLE and L'ANGLE, ministers of the same church, has been already adduced, and is well worthy of attention.

Let us pass on from the Calvinistic to the LUTHERAN churches. The Lutheran churches of *Sweden* and *Denmark* have preserved the EPISCOPAL SUCCESSION.‡ And even those

* The letter is published at length in Durel's "View of the Government and Worship of the Reformed Churches."

† The letter is published in Durel's "View," &c.

‡ In Sweden and Denmark, the Roman Catholic Bishops were compelled to submit to the Reformation; their temporal power was abolished; and they retained only the spiritual part of the Episcopal office.

Lutheran churches of *Germany* who could not preserve the *succession of Bishops*, entertained so great a respect for Episcopacy, and for its ancient and primitive claims, and were also so impressed with its *utility*, that they adopted and still maintain the *forms* of Episcopacy; having distinction of rank in the ministry, and placing over the clergy *superintendents*, to exercise the general powers of superintendence and government.

Now I may confidently appeal to any candid person—If Episcopacy were a novel institution; if it had been unknown to the apostolic and primitive church; if it had sprung from that accursed ambition, and desire of "lording it over God's heritage," which nourished and advanced to full stature the "man of sin;" if Episcopacy were, as you maintain, "unscriptural and anti-Christian," would the REFORMED CHURCHES have spoken thus respectfully of it? Would some of the LUTHERAN CHURCHES, who were unable to obtain the *Episcopal succession*, have yet preserved, as far as possible, the *forms* of *Episcopacy*? Would the CALVINISTIC REFORMERS and divines have commended "a well-ordered *Episcopacy*," such an Episcopacy as the *Church of England* possessed, as both "suitable with reason, and agreeing with holy scripture?" Would they have pleaded that "necessity obliged them to depart from it;" that "as the Reformation was begun by the people and inferior churches, the places of the Bishops remained filled by those of a contrary religion?" Would they have lamented that "the state of affairs did not permit them to hope for obtaining it," and have prayed that "God would assist them by his grace and favour, while they did all in their power to obtain it?" Would the great reformer, CALVIN, have expressed his approbation of it, and pronounced an awful ANATHEMA on all those who should reject it? Could these illustrious Reformers and divines have been ignorant of the constitution of the primitive church—they who by their talents and learning felled the deep-rooted and towering pretensions of the Pope of Rome?

Could they who beheld in the Bishops who surrounded them the obsequious flatterers and tools of the papal church, have had any inducement to flatter this order as "under any form," primitive and apostolic? Could they, who boldly defied the papal thunder that rolled over them, have wanted the courage and the zeal to renounce and oppose the order of Bishops, if, with the Presbyterians of later ages, they had believed this order, "under whatever form or pretext adopted, was unscriptural and anti-Christian?" Ah! sir, beware how you grossly libel the talents, learning, piety and zeal of these "heroes of the truth, who rescued millions from the man of sin, lighted up the lamp of pure religion, and left it burning with a pure and steady light to the generation following."* No, their testimony in favour of Episcopacy can only be accounted for, consistently with an acknowledgment of their learning and their piety, on the principle laid down by Daille, that "the foundation of the charge of Bishops is good and lawful, established by the Apostles, according to the command of Christ, in the churches which they founded."†

Here then methinks the dispute between us should end. Here then Episcopacy may take her stand, and convict of gross departure from the original‡ principles of the Reformed churches, and expose to the ANATHEMA of CALVIN, all who shall refuse to "reverence her, and submit themselves to her with the utmost obedience."§ In this view of the subject it is of no importance whether Episcopacy, as the divinely instituted method of conveying the ministerial authority be unalterable, or whether it be only an ancient and primitive practice, instituted for the preservation of peace

* Christian's Magazine, p. 96.

† Daille here means such Bishops as the Church of England possessed See p. 93, 94.

‡ I say *original;* for it is certain they did not all continue to maintain those sentiments concerning the Episcopacy of the Church of England which they at first expressed.

§ See Calvin's Declarations, p. 91.

and unity in the church. Whatever be the authority for it, we find the universal church in possession of it at the Reformation. We find by far the greater proportion of the Reformed churches preserving Episcopacy (purified from Papal corruptions) either in *substance* or in *form*.* We find those reformers who renounced it acknowledging that it was an ancient and primitive institution; and lamenting the unfortunate circumstances which compelled them to depart from it. They pleaded that they could not get, as Calvin expresses it, "such an hierarchy in which the Bishops did not refuse to be subject to Christ."

How then should a considerate non-Episcopalian argue? "There can surely be nothing 'anti-Christian or unscriptural' in Episcopacy, or those 'faithful ministers, who went away to their Father's house, under the strong consolations of the Holy Ghost, with anticipated heaven in their hearts, and its hallelujahs on their lips,'"† would not have revered it as a primitive and ancient institution, would not have lamented their want of it, would not have denounced an *anathema* against all who should wilfully reject it. A well-ordered Episcopacy, free from Papal corruptions, now subsists, and is within my embrace. The plea of necessity forsakes me. By embracing Episcopacy, I shall at any rate be on the safe side. Agreeably to the concessions of all Christians, I shall then enjoy the true ministry and ordi-

* Presbyterians remain as they were at first, a comparatively *small sect* among Christians. The GREEK and LATIN churches are Episcopal. So also are the LUTHERAN churches of *Sweden* and *Denmark;* the Church of the *United Brethren*, or *Moravians;* some Protestant churches in *Bohemia;* and the *churches of England* and *Ireland;* the venerable remains of the ancient Episcopal Church of *Scotland;* and the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country. The *Lutheran* churches of *Germany*, though destitute of the *Episcopal succession*, are yet *Episcopal* in their form of government. The *Presbyterians* consist of only a few churches on the Continent, some of the dissenting churches in England and Ireland, the established Church of Scotland, and the Seceding churches, and the Presbyterian churches in this country.

† Christian's Magazine, p. 96.

nances of Christ's Church. I shall submit to an apostolic and primitive institution, and thus contribute to heal the divisions that corrupt the truth, and cause the enemies of Zion to laugh her to scorn. I shall promote the "peace of Jerusalem," and thus contribute to make her a "praise throughout the earth." Yes, sir, what reply would you make to a considerate non-Episcopalian who should thus address you? You could not say that Episcopacy was "unscriptural and anti-Christian;" for then he would urge against you the concessions of all the Reformed churches at the outset of the Reformation. He would urge against you the *anathema* of *Calvin*, that illustrious man who is considered as the founder of your churches; who, according to Mr. M'L. "equalled his contemporaries in piety, accuracy, knowledge, and faithfulness, and surpassed them in the grandeur of his conceptions."* Nay, sir, he would urge against you your own confession. For you say, "an *Episcopal Church* we do know, in which there are hundreds of ministers and thousands of their people who are 'valiant for the truth,' who exemplify in their own persons the loveliness of the Christian character," &c. &c.† Now, this church which you thus extol, and which is the Calvinistic part of the Church of England, maintains and submits to that very *Episcopacy* which you are asserting is "unscriptural and anti-Christian."

Nor could you urge on the non-Episcopalian the duty of remaining separate from the Episcopal Church, by the plea that she imposes, as terms of communion, doctrines *sinful* and contrary to scripture. This indeed, is the plea by which Protestants justify their separation from the corrupt Church of Rome, and refute all the arguments in favour of communion with it. But this assertion you dare not make. The testimonies of the Reformed churches in favour of the

* "Reformation Principles," a book drawn up by Mr. M'L. and published as the standard of doctrine of his church, p. 58.

† Christian's Magazine, p. 103.

Church of England would rise in judgment against you. You have yourself commended, in the highest terms, an "Episcopal Church," which glories in the same *articles of faith*, the same *Episcopacy*, the same *worship*, the same *rites and ceremonies* which the Episcopal Church possesses in this country. Nay, if there is any difference, it is in favour of the latter. For Episcopacy is here divested of those adventitious circumstances of temporal power and grandeur which, in the opinion of some of its friends, have not always operated to its benefit.

By what other argument would you answer the plea of the non-Episcopalian, that it is safest to join the Episcopal Church, in which, confessedly, there are valid ministrations and ordinances? Would you urge that it would be sinful in him to join that church because, in your judgment, its members do not exhibit the "power of godliness," and its ministers are not evangelical preachers? Admitting your assertion, which I contend is erroneous, to be well founded; still, none will deny that the *articles* and *prayers* of the church are sound and evangelical. The defects of its members, and the want of good preaching, therefore, cannot be admitted as conclusive arguments against union with a church where there is a *certainty* of a valid ministry and ordinances. The plea of *greater edification*, of *purer administrations*, is the ostensible plea of almost every schism that has rent the church. The admission of it would excite and sanction endless divisions, and a spirit of disorder, enthusiasm and fanaticism destructive to sober truth, to sound piety, to the peace and order of Zion. The admission of this plea would exalt *preaching* above public worship, and those other *ordinances* which are the "signs and seals of the covenant of grace." Such an admission, therefore, would be contrary to the principles of the Presbyterian Church; for she justly and wisely declares, "one *primary* design of public ordinances is to pay *social acts of homage* to the Most High God." "Sermons ought not to be so long as to interfere with the more *impor-*

*tant* duties of *prayer* and *praise*."* A defect must be *fundamental;* terms of communion must be sinful, absolutely *contrary* to the divine word, and incompatible with the paramount duty of obeying God rather than man,† before a Christian will be justifiable or safe in renouncing a church where, by the concessions of all, there is a *certainty* of a valid ministry and ordinances, and in joining churches, in which, on the subject of "these signs and seals of the covenant," there is, to say the least, in the estimation of many, considerable *doubt*.

Admirable is the reasoning by which CALVIN proves that the plea of *purer administrations* and *greater edification* will not justify separation from a church in whose doctrines or ministrations there is nothing *fundamentally sinful*. "There may *some faultiness* creep into the church, in the administration either of *doctrine* or of the *sacraments*, which ought not to estrange us from the communion of it."‡ "Among the Corinthians not only a few had gone out of the way, but the infection had in a manner seized the *whole body:* there was not only one kind of sin, but many: neither were they light offences, but certain horrible outrageous doings; it was not only *corruption* of *manners*, but also of *doctrine*. What in this case, saith the holy Apostle, the instrument of the Holy Ghost, by whose testimony the church standeth or falleth? *Doth he require a division from them?* Doth he banish them out of the kingdom of Christ? Doth he strike them by the extremest thunderbolt of his curse? He not only *doeth none of these things*, but he both *acknowledgeth and proclaimeth it a church of Christ and fellowship of saints*."§

CALVIN refutes the plea for schism and for refusing to commune with a true church, because some of its members are corrupt in their lives and manners. "It is one thing to

* Directory for Worship, Presbyterian Church, chap. vi. 4.

† On this ground is separation from the Church of Rome justified.

‡ Calvin's Institutes, book iv. chap. i. sect. 12.

§ Calvin's Institutes, book iv. chap. i. sect. 14.

flee the company of evil men, and another thing for hatred of them to forsake the communion of the church. But whereas they think it sacrilege to be partakers of the Lord's bread with them, they are therein much more rigorous than Paul is. For where he exhorts us to a holy and pure partaking, he requireth *not that one should examine another*, or *every man the whole church*, but that they should *each one prove himself*. 1 Cor. xi. 18. If it were unlawful to communicate with an unworthy man, then truly Paul would bid us to look circumspectly, whether there were any in the multitude by whose uncleanness we might be defiled. Now, when he requireth only of every man the proof of himself, he showeth that it does not in the least injure us if any *unworthy persons thrust themselves in among us.*"*

CALVIN, as a further proof that we ought not to separate from any church whose doctrines are sound and valid, because its members are corrupt, instances the corrupt state of the Jewish church during the times of the Prophets. "*Religion* was partly *despised*, partly *defiled*. In their *manners* are commonly reported thefts, extortions, breaches of faith, murders and like mischiefs. But therefore the Prophets did *neither erect to themselves new churches*, nor build up *new altars* on which they might have several sacrifices; but of *whatsoever manner of men* they were, they considered that *God had left his word with them*, and ordained *ceremonies whereby he was there worshipped:* in the midst of the assembly of the wicked they held up pure hands unto him. Truly if they had thought that they did gather any infection thereby, they would rather have died a hundred times than have suffered themselves to be drawn thereunto. Therefore nothing held them from departing, but desire to the *keeping of unity*. But if the Prophets thought it *against conscience to estrange themselves from the church for many and great wicked doings*, not of one or two men, but in a manner of the *whole people*, then we take too much upon us, if immediately

* Calvin's Institutes, book iv. chap. 1. sect. 15.

we dare to depart from the communion of that church where not all *men's manners* do satisfy our judgment, yea, or the Christian profession."*

Would to God that all those who make greater edification the plea for rending the peace of the church, would listen to the remonstrances of Calvin! How clearly does he prove that corruptions in doctrine, unless they be fundamental, or defects in the lives of the ministers or members of a church which is sound in the essential points of doctrine, and which possesses a valid ministry and ordinances, will not justify separation!† There is, then, a rule by which the plainest Christian may be regulated. He should choose that church which does not prescribe terms of communion *fundamentally sinful*, and which even her opponents acknowledge possesses a valid ministry and ordinances.

Sir, a non-Episcopalian may compel you, on your own principles, to admit that it is safest and best to "rush into the arms of an Episcopal church," in which it is possible to be "valiant for the truth," and to "exemplify all the loveliness of the Christian character;" in which he will be sure of enjoying valid ministrations; and in which he will enjoy that Episcopacy which is the centre of *unity* in the church; which CALVIN once commended as ancient and primitive; and the want of which many divines of the Reformed churches deplored.

Your friends in the Church of England, the *Wilberforces*, the *Thorntons*, the *Grants*, and others, will doubtless consider your commendation of them as no more than a just return for

* Calvin's Institutes, book iv. chap. i. sect. 18.

† What judgment do you think CALVIN would have pronounced on the *Secession* from the Church of Scotland, the principles of which *secession* are still maintained by you, and lead you and others to remain *separate* from the church commonly known as the Presbyterian Church in this country? What judgment would he have pronounced on Mr. M'L. and his religious society, commonly distinguished as COVENANTERS, who refuse Church fellowship with all other Christians, and confine the *pure word and ordinances* to their own sect, which is scarcely known in the Christian world?

their attention to you, and for the pecuniary favours which the religious society to which you belong received from them. These commendations may induce them to pass over other parts of your review which bear not very lightly on that "external order," and that venerable church to which it is their pride to adhere. I shall be the last man to complain of your commendation of them, even though it is accompanied by the unjust, unfounded, and cruel aspersion, that they are "hated, reviled, persecuted" by such "high Churchmen as Mr. H. and his friends."* No, Sir, Mr. H. and his friends detest the spirit and the conduct which you indirectly ascribe to them. While they respect the right of other religious denominations to profess and maintain their principles, *Churchmen* trust that there is not a system of denunciation and persecution organized to deter them from the exercise of the same right. They revere, they esteem, they love the Christian spirit, the "power of godliness," by whomsoever manifested. And you ought to know that DAUBENY, whom you denounce as among these persecuting Churchmen, in all his writings, speaks in the most exalted terms of *Wilberforce*, and with the utmost moderation and mildness opposes what he deems his errors. "High Churchmen in England hate, revile, persecute" the Calvinistic members of that church! My impression is directly the reverse. It is well known that these people, whom you so much extol, "hate, revile, persecute," all ministers of the church who will not preach the *peculiarities of Calvinism*, the doctrines of *unconditional election*, *irresistible grace*, and *final perseverance;* denouncing those who reject these doctrines as not being "gospel preachers," as strangers to "the power of godliness," and resting merely in its "form." Sir Richard Hill, the leader of the Calvinistic band in the Church of England, in his criticisms on Daubeny's Guide to the Church, remarks, that "few will presume to question the doctrine of particular election" (in the sense in which it is held by Calvinists)—"but they who

* Christian's Magazine, p. 103, &c.

are *strangers to the power of sin in themselves*, or to the *riches of grace in God?*" What is this if it is not "reviling and persecuting?" And what return does DAUBENY give to this harsh treatment? "As a pious and exemplary Christian, I look up to you, Sir, with respect; I could almost add, with veneration; for I cannot but venerate a man who, in the midst of great worldly consideration, attends to the first and most important duties of life."* Does this look like hating, reviling, persecuting? It pains me to find you involving, in such general and unjust charges, individuals who have the misfortune to incur your displeasure for asserting the claims of *Episcopacy*.

Gratified with your strong commendations of "an Episcopal Church," I shall not inquire how you will reconcile these commendations with the standards of your church, which pronounce Episcopacy to be "unscriptural and anti-Christian." It is not my business to inquire how you will answer the charge of forsaking the principles of the *Seceders* in Scotland, from whom your religious society is descended, and with whom you yet preserve some kind of ecclesiastical intercourse. Hatred to *prelacy*, to the "hierarchy in its various modifications," first vented in the "solemn league and covenant," has been cherished and displayed in the various religious "testimonies," which the Seceders in Scotland, and the corresponding sects in this country, have set forth. Yet in the face of those solemn testimonies you extol, in the warmest language, "an Episcopal Church," which submits to a *prelacy;* Ministers who compose a part of the *hierarchy*, and derive their commission from usurping Bishops; and Laymen who cherish this "hierarchical" church, as the bulwark of Christendom and Christianity. I sincerely wish you may run no risque of being accused of "*trimming* on the points of faith and duty!"

* Daubeny's Appendix to his Guide. Introductory letter.

## LETTER X.

SIR,

ONE important title, then, by which Bishop's hold their powers, is *prescription*, the *universal* and *immemorial usage of the Christian Church*. The burden of proof is thus placed upon the opponents of Episcopacy. They are bound to ascertain precisely and determinately the period when *Presbyters* possessed *solely* the ministerial power, and when the Bishops usurped, throughout the whole Christian Church, their *superior prerogatives*. If the records of the early ages take no notice of an event so memorable; if, while they record minutely the heresies and the schisms which distracted the church, they take no notice of a heresy and schism in which Bishops, not in some particular province, but throughout the world, usurped superior powers; if the early records take no notice of a fact which, shaking the church to its foundations, must have been of the most important and public notoriety; the conclusion is certain and irresistible, that no such usurpation took place; but that the Bishops hold their powers by the same tenure which supports Presbyters in theirs, the institution of Christ and his Apostles.*

* It has been asserted, that the WALDENSES, who separated in the twelfth century from the Church of Rome, were, in "the order of their church," and in their form of government, "strictly Presbyterian." They were, on the contrary, *strictly Episcopal*. MOSHEIM, who certainly was not very partial to the Episcopal cause, asserts, "The government of the church was committed by the Waldenses to *Bishops*, *Presbyters*, and *Deacons;* for they acknowledged that these three ecclesiastical orders were instituted by Christ himself."* Another historian† asserts, that "the Protestants of Bohemia, who were apprehensive that *ordinations*, in which *Presbyters* and not a *Bishop* should create another Presbyter, would not be *lawful*—sent deputies to the remains of the ancient *Waldenses*, upon the confines of Moravia and Austria, by *whose Bishops* these deputies were consecrated to the *Episcopal office*, which they have ever since *transmitted to their successors*." And the learned Dr. Allix,

* Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, century twelfth, part ii. chap. v.

† Commenius, quoted in Dr. Chandler's Appeal defended.

For an examination of this important question, whether the powers of Bishops are an usurpation, no period could have been more favourable than the *Reformation*. Bishops were part of the hierarchy of the Church of Rome. Against this corrupt church the indignant zeal of the Reformers was roused. They wanted not motives, and surely they wanted not the talents and learning to test the pretensions of the Bishops, to unmask these usurpers, if such they were, and to consign them to that merited execration with which they regarded the corrupt hierarchy of the Church of Rome. On examining the sentiments of the Reformers, we find, to our astonishment, that instead of treating a *primitive Episcopacy*, "such as the Church of England possessed," as an *usurpation*, they regarded it with approbation; expressed the hope, that "the Church of England might long enjoy it;" and even denounced an *anathema* against all who should reject it.

That these were the sentiments of CALVIN and other eminent divines of the Reformed churches concerning the *Episcopacy of the Church of England*, sufficient proof has, I conceive, been adduced in my last letter. I cannot avoid, however, calling your attention to the following corroborating evidence, that Calvin and the Reformed divines approved of the Episcopacy of the Church of England, and would have adopted it, had circumstances favoured such a measure. The diligent, learned and accurate historian, STRYPE, furnishes this evidence. It may be proper to premise, that the following quotations from this historian, have been adduced as decisive evidence of the preference of Calvin and other Reformed divines to the English Episcopacy, by the Rev. AUGUSTUS TOPLADY, in his "Historic Proof of the Doctrinal Calvinism of the Church of England." TOPLADY, let it be remembered, was a *rigid Calvinist;* a warm admirer and

in his "Remarks on the ancient Churches of Piedmont," proves, that though the WALDENSES opposed the *corrupt hierarchy* of the *Church of Rome*, they still held to the three primitive orders of *Bishops*, *Priests*. and *Deacons*.

panegyrist of Calvin; and his works rank high in the estimation of Calvinists.*

Strype and Toplady both adduce the passage in which Calvin denounces an *anathema* against all who should reject a primitive hierarchy as a proof of his approbation of the Episcopacy of the Church of England. Toplady observes, "that great reformer (Calvin) *wished* for the introduction of *Protestant Episcopacy* into the *Reformed churches abroad.*"† And then he quotes the following passage from Strype—"How Calvin stood affected in the said point of *Episcopacy*, and how *readily and gladly he and other heads of the Reformed churches would* have received it, is evident enough from his writings and epistles. In his book of the necessity of reforming the church, he hath these words: "*Talem nobis hierarchiam exhibeant*," &c.—*Let them give us such an hierarchy*, &c.‡ Toplady agrees with Strype in considering the above passage as a proof that "Calvin's opinion was favourable to the *English Episcopacy.*"§

Toplady asserts, that "Calvin made a serious motion of uniting Protestants together;"‖ and, in proof of his assertion, quotes again from Strype—"They (the foreign Protestants) took such great joy and satisfaction in this good king (Edward VI.) and his establishment of religion, that Bullinger, Calvin, and others, in a letter to him, offered to make him their defender, and *to have Bishops in their churches, as there were in England;* with a tender of their service to assist and

* The accuracy and fidelity of Strype as a historian, has never, I believe, been impeached. We are indebted to his faithful and indefatigable industry for much valuable information relative to the Reformation, in his "Annals," and other works, particularly his "Lives" of the Archbishops Cranmer, Parker, and others. He is characterized by Toplady as "an useful and laborious collector,"* and as an "excellent historian;"† and is frequently quoted as authority by him.

† Toplady's Works, vol. ii. p. 153. London edition.

‡ Strype's Life of Archbishop Parker, p. 69, 70.

§ Toplady's Works, vol. ii. p. 153. ‖ p. 151.

* Toplady's Works, vol. ii. p. 17, note. † p. 15.

unite together."* Of this scheme of CALVIN to unite Protestant churches under Bishops, such as the Church of England enjoyed, TOPLADY observes, "Nothing could be more wisely or more benevolently planned than this excellent scheme. It was, however, frustrated; and frustrated by whom? By the Papists of that time," who, "by dint of collusive management, disconcerted a measure so formidable to the interests of Rome." For "they verily thought that all the *heretics*, as they called them, would now unite among themselves, and become one body, *receiving the same discipline exercised in England;* which, if it should happen, and they should have heretical *Bishops* near them in those parts, they concluded that *Rome and her clergy would utterly fall.*"† TOPLADY observes on this statement, "the restless intrigues of the emissaries of the Church of Rome, who, under various characters and appearances, went about sowing division, and seeking to unsettle the minds of the people, doubtless contributed much to impede and dissipate the intended salutary *union.*" Thus then this plan of "*embracing into one church* all the friends of the Reformation in every country," which Mr. M'Leod considers as an evidence of the "capacious mind" of CALVIN, and of the "grandeur of his conceptions,"‡ contemplated their "receiving the same *discipline* exercised in *England*," their "having *Bishops* in their churches, as there were in England!" CALVIN proposed that EPISCOPACY—yes, such an EPISCOPACY as the Church of England possessed, should constitute the UNITY of the church, that "essential principle of Christ's kingdom."§

* Strype's Memorials of Cranmer, p. 207.

† And yet Episcopalians are sometimes sneeringly impeached with being only a few "bowshots off from the territories of our sovereign lord the Pope." The fact is, that the Church of Rome has always regarded, with the most lively apprehensions, the Church of England, from the persuasion that from her being so nearly conformed to the primitive and purest age of the church, she is the most dangerous enemy to papal usurpations and corruptions.

‡ Reformation principles, p. 58. § p. 55.

Toplady adduces from Strype "another very remarkable proof, both of Calvin's *regard* for *Episcopacy*, and of the manner in which a seeming difference arose between the plan of ecclesiastical government adopted by that Reformer, and the plan of Episcopal government adopted by the Church of England. Toplady quotes "a curious paper, in Archbishop Abbot's own hand-writing, found among Archbishop Usher's manuscripts, and published by Strype;" and then subjoins—"So wrote that most respectable prelate, Archbishop Abbot, whose evidence may be thus summed up—Calvin's last letter concerning *Episcopacy*, sent to the ruling clergy of England, in the reign of Edward VI. was craftily intercepted by Bonner and Gardiner; who (to crush Calvin's scheme for *episcopising the foreign Protestant churches*) forged a surly, snappish answer to Calvin, in the names of the divines to whom his letter had been addressed, but whose hands it had never reached. Calvin, being disgusted at the rudeness with which he supposed his overture had been received here, dropt all thoughts of making any further advances on the subject. And thus had not two Popish extinguishers put out the design, Calvin *had admitted the discipline of the Church of England*, with as much zeal and heartiness as the Church of England actually adopted Calvin's doctrine."* How far the Church of England "adopted Calvin's *doctrine*" will be best ascertained by a comparison of her Articles and Liturgy with his *Institutes;* by which it will appear, that on all the *distinctive* points of Calvinism, there is the most marked difference between the language of the Church of England in her Articles and Liturgy, and the Institutes of Calvin. In the above passage, however, we have the decided opinion of an eminent Calvinistic historian and writer, founded on the most satisfactory documents, that Calvin was attached to the Episcopacy of the Church of England, and was desirous to introduce it into all the Reformed churches.

* Toplady's Works, vol. ii. p. 153, 154, note.

The same historian, TOPLADY, asserts—"Nor did Calvin's learned colleague and successor, the illustrious BEZA, entertain a less respectful idea of our national establishment."* In proof of this, Toplady introduces from Strype an account of a letter from Beza, in answer to one from Archbishop Whitgift, "blaming him for his (supposed) meddling with the church and state of England without any lawful commission." In his defence Beza states that the letter of the Archbishop "indeed troubled both him and Sadeel (another of the ministers of Geneva) in some sort; as being greatly afraid, lest some sinister rumours were brought to him (to the Archbishop) concerning them; or lest what they had written, concerning church government, *properly against the anti-Christian tyranny* (of the Romish Church,) as NECESSITY *required*, might be taken by some in that sense, as though they ever meant to compel to their order those churches that thought otherwise. That such arrogancy was far from them," &c. &c.† TOPLADY further remarks—"As to Beza, if he were afterwards so far wrought upon, by dint of misrepresentation, as to countenance, in any measure, the forwardness of the more rigid disciplinarians" (the opponents of the Church of England,) "it ought, in justice, to be imputed neither to any levity nor duplicity in him (for he was equally incapable of both,) but to the wrong informations that were sent to him, by which a foreigner who resided at so great a distance from England, might, easily enough, be liable to undue impression."‡ TOPLADY also urges the testimony of the famous SYNOD of DORT in favour of the Episcopacy of the Church of England, as an evidence, "that the affection of the foreign Reformed churches to a Protestant and primitive Episcopacy, did not expire with the life of Calvin."§

* Toplady's Works, vol. ii. p. 16.

† It is worthy of remark, that this letter of Beza to Archbishop Whitgift, containing concessions in favour of the Episcopacy of the Church of England, was written several years after some of his works which contained different sentiments.

‡ Toplady's Works, vol. ii. p. 18. § p. 154.

After thus adducing evidence of the attachment of the foreign Reformers to the Episcopacy of the Church of England, this *Calvinistic* writer and historian, TOPLADY, observes, "CALVIN, BEZA, ZANCHIUS, SADEEL, BULLINGER and GUALTER, entertained very respectful and affectionate sentiments, concerning the *ritual, decency and order*, together with the EPISCOPAL REGIMEN, of our INCOMPARABLE CHURCH. And to the approbation of those most learned persons might be added (if need required) that of *many other foreign Calvinists*, who are deservedly numbered among the first ornaments of that country."*

If these testimonies of CALVIN, BEZA, and other Reformed divines in favour of the Episcopacy of the Church of England, cannot be urged as conclusive evidence that these Reformers advanced it to the rank of a divine institution, they at least show that they approved of it as an ANCIENT and PRIMITIVE institution, handed down from the APOSTOLIC AGE; that imperious circumstances only led them to deviate from it, and prevented the execution of a plan to introduce it into all the Reformed churches. Alas! that a plan which displayed "the grandeur of the conceptions" of the great Reformer CALVIN, should have failed. The Protestant churches, cemented by the *ancient*, *primitive* and *venerable* bond of Episcopacy, would have been at UNITY among themselves; and thus have set at defiance the insidious arts and open assaults of popery, the ravages of heresy and schism, and the scoffs of infidelity. "Jerusalem would have been as a city that is at *unity* in itself." The prayer of Jesus for his followers would have been answered—*that they all might be* ONE.

I call then on every candid non-Episcopalian seriously to weigh the sentiments on the subject of Episcopacy of these pious and holy men, who "lighted up the lamp of pure religion." To suppose that, if they had viewed Episcopacy as an usurpation, any "human regards" would have led them not only to disguise their sentiments, but to speak in the

* Toplady's Works, vol. ii. p. 19.

most respectful terms of it, and and even to wish its universal adoption as the *bond of* UNITY *in the church*, would be to fix an indelible stigma on their character; to impeach that exalted *integrity* and *firmness* which it is our glory to claim for the "heroes of the Reformation." To suppose, on the other hand, that they were incapable of examing the claims of *Episcopacy*, would be an impeachment of their talents, their learning and zeal. The *inquisitive*, the *jealous*, the *learned*, the *pious*, the *faithful* period of the Reformation, *applauded* and *sanctioned* the *Episcopacy of the Church of England*. What that period failed to discover or proclaim has been reserved for the superior *jealousy*, *learning*, *piety* and *faithfulness* of a later age! A primitive Episcopacy, such as the Church of England possesses, is *now* denounced as an *usurpation*, as "anti-Christian, and unscriptural." "Venerable CALVIN!" stay thy awful ANATHEMA. "Illustrious BEZA!" I hear thee pouring forth the indignant language—"God forbid that any man of a sound mind should assent to the madness of such men."*

This title then of ANCIENT USAGE—a title acknowledged by those eminent Reformers who were led by imperious circumstances to deviate from Episcopacy, should induce every Christian, when it is in his power, to embrace that church which enjoys the "singular blessing" of a *primitive Episcopacy*, reformed from Papal corruptions. Prudence obviously dictates this choice. *Of the validity of Episcopal ministrations there never has been, there never can be the least doubt:* while the validity of non-Episcopal ministrations, whatever allowance in certain cases may be made by the judgment of charity, remains still, to say the least, a *disputed point*.

But Episcopacy claims our reception by a still higher title. EPISCOPACY rests on DIVINE AUTHORITY. It is the *institution of Christ and his Apostles*.

In discussing any subject, it is essential to the discovery of truth, and to bringing the discussion to a speedy issue, that

* See page 95.

the precise point in dispute should be clearly ascertained, and the proposition to be proved plainly and definitively stated. The opponents of Episcopacy have often connected with it points that are not essential to it; and when they have demolished these, they triumphantly suppose that the cause of Episcopacy is subverted.

The essential and characteristic principles of Episcopacy are—That there are *three* grades of ministers instituted by *Christ and his Apostles;* that the *first* grade, in addition to the ministerial powers, possess the *sole power of ordination*, with the *right* of exercising *supreme authority* over the *congregations* and *ministers* who may be subject to them.

From this statement of the *essentials* of Episcopacy, the following conclusions result.

1. *It is immaterial* by what *names* these grades of the ministry are distinguished.

The question concerns merely the *distinctive powers* which they possess; and the *subordination* of the two inferior grades to the first. Episcopalians concede that the names of *Bishop*, *Presbyter*, and *Deacon*, are, in scripture, interchangeably applied to the three grades. Still it is apparent, from the different *powers which they exercised*, or which were committed to them, that there was a distinction of authority, and a subordination among them. It would be fallacious and unfair to argue from a community of names, to a community of all ministerial powers; or to ascertain their *appropriate* and *distinctive* powers by the names applied to them. The term *Deacon*, signifying a *minister*, may be very properly applied to all the three grades. The term *Presbyter*, signifying a *church officer*, may also be indiscriminately applied. And *Bishop*, signifying an *overseer*, may be applied to a Presbyter, who has the *oversight* of a *congregation*, as well as to the highest grade of the ministry, who possess the right of *overseeing* ministers and congregations. The *distinction* and *subordination* of their powers is a matter of fact, to be ascertained by an appeal to *scripture*, illustrated and cor-

roborated by the *universal practice* and testimony of the *primitive church*. "Mere *names* are of little real value."* "It is for the *thing* not the name, we should contend."† The three grades of the ministry were distinguished at first by the names *Apostles; Presbyters*, or *Elders*—called also Bishops, as *overseeing* a particular flock—and Deacons. And after the death of the Apostles, the term *Bishop* became appropriate to their successors in the ordinary ecclesiastical powers of ordination and government; and the two inferior grades were styled *Presbyters* or *Priests*, and *Deacons*.

Let it then be noted, that the *distinction* and *subordination* of the offices of these three grades of the ministry is to be inferred, not from their names, but from their *practices*, from the *powers vested in them*, and from their *acts of jurisdiction*. Desperate indeed must be the cause of the opponents of Episcopacy, when they insist that the grades of ministers now distinguished as Bishops and Presbyters possessed originally the *same* powers, because these names were originally applied to the same order. Who would think of inferring that our Saviour was no more than an *Apostle* or a *Bishop*, because these names are applied to him?‡ Or, who would think of maintaining that the *Consuls* of the present day are the same with those of the Roman Republic, because they are distinguished by the same names?

2. Episcopalians consider also as merely *verbal* the dispute whether Bishops and Presbyters are distinct *orders*, or different *grades* of the same order.

They conceive indeed that as *Presbyters* are superior in power to *Deacons*, and *Bishops* to *Presbyters;* and as they are advanced to these superior powers by ordination, the Church of England is justified in declaring,§ that there are three "*orders* of ministers in Christ's Church." But still many of the *schoolmen*, and some few divines even of the Church of England, are of opinion, that though Bishops are

* Mr. M'Leod's Ecclesiastical Catechism, p. 30. † p. 18.
‡ Heb. iii. 1. 1 Pet. ii. 25. § Preface to Ordination Service.

superior to Presbyters in the power of ordination, they are, nevertheless, the same order, as having the same *priesthood*. It would be absurd to conclude from hence, that these divines believed Bishops are on an equality with Presbyters. They contend, on the contrary, that Bishops are invested by ordination or consecration, with that power of ordaining others which Presbyters have not. The only thing, therefore, essential is, that Bishops possess, by apostolic institution, certain *powers*, distinct from and superior to the ordinary powers of Presbyters. This proved, the question in regard to the distinction or community of order becomes a mere dispute about words.

Bishops and Presbyters, with regard to the *priesthood* common to both, by which they were distinguished from Deacons and from the people, might be considered as the same order. Still, in regard to authority and jurisdiction, dignity and power, a Bishop was above a Presbyter. To contend that there were not three grades of ministers in the primitive church, because they were sometimes included in the two names, of *Bishops* and *Deacons*, *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, would be as absurd as to contend that there were not the three orders, of High Priest, Priests, and Levites, among the Jews, because the Jewish priesthood is sometimes included in the two terms, *Priests* and *Levites;* or that there is in the present day only one order of ministers in the Episcopal Church, because the three orders, are often denoted by the single appellation of Ministers, or Priests, or Clergy. Because *Clemens Romanus*, an ancient Father, divides the clergy into two orders, Bishops and Deacons, it is contended that there were in his day only two orders in the church. As well might we contend that there was no High Priest superior to Priests and Levites, because *Clemens* divides the Jewish ministry into Priests and Levites.

3. Nor is it essential to the *peculiar* and *distinctive* functions of a Bishop, that he should always *actually* exercise power over *ministers* and *congregations;* but it is essential

that he should *possess* the power, though it be not called into *exercise*.

A Bishop may sometimes be deprived of his *diocese*, of his ministers and congregations, by the civil authority. In this situation were several Bishops in England and Scotland, who were deprived of their dioceses at the Revolution in 1688. But a Bishop either deprived of, or relinquishing his diocese, no more loses his Episcopal functions than a Presbyter ceases to be a Presbyter when he gives up his congregation, and remains without any pastoral charge. In the early ages of Christianity, a Bishop may have been sometimes placed in a city or village where there was but one congregation of Christians. Still the Bishop possessed the power of ordaining Presbyters and Deacons, and of exercising authority over them. As the number of Christians multiplied, the new congregations, supplied by his Presbyters and Deacons, remained subject to him. But the Bishop, while there was but one congregation in his diocese, no more lost his peculiar and superior powers, than the Bishop in the city of Philadelphia or New-York, would lose his Episcopal functions, should persecution or any other event diminish his diocese to one single congregation.

It is the *possession of the right* to exercise authority over Presbyters and congregations, and not the *actual exercise* of this right, dependent as this exercise is upon circumstances, which is an essential characteristic of the *Episcopal grade* of the ministry. Nor does this bring a Bishop of the Episcopal Church to a *level*, or identify him, with a *Congregational* or *Presbyterian Bishop*, who oversees only *one* congregation. This latter can have no Presbyters, possessing the powers of the ministry, subject to him. He is himself the only person in the congregation vested with the power of preaching the word, and administering the sacraments. His Elders are merely aids to him in discipline; and his Deacons are officers who have the care of the poor and some other *temporal* functions. The right to exercise power over other congregations

and their pastors, is no part of his office. But a *Bishop* of the *Episcopal* Church possesses the *right to exercise authority over Presbyters and Deacons*, who have the *ministry* of the *word* and *sacraments;* and also over the *congregations*, in which these Presbyters and Deacons minister. Peculiar circumstances may sometimes prevent the *actual exercise* of his powers, but cannot divest him of them.

4. The *name* or the *extent* of the Bishop's *charge*, or his not being *exclusively* fixed to any *particular district*, does not affect his *distinctive* and *essential* powers.

The charge of a Bishop is now called a *Diocese*, and that of a Presbyter a *Parish*. But to the fourth century the common name of an Episcopal diocese was παροικία, answering nearly to the English word *parish*. This signified not the places or habitations near a *church*, but a *city* and the *towns and villages near it*. These, together with the city, constituted the *charge* of a Bishop, his παροικία, or parish, or, as it is now called, his *diocese*. But it would be unfair and absurd to argue from the circumstance of the Bishop's charge being originally called his *parish*, that it was, what that name now commonly signifies, a single congregation or pastoral care. Arguments drawn from *sameness* of *names*, to prove *sameness* of *powers*, of *persons*, or of *things*, are always liable to be fallacious, and betray the weakness of the cause into the service of which they are pressed. "Names are of little real value."* They are changeable in their signification; and in different places, and at different periods are variously applied. The extent of a Bishop's charge, whether confined to a single congregation, or extending over several congregations, is a *matter of fact*, to be determined not by the *name* given to the charge, but by other circumstances. The word παροικία, or parish, is applied by Eusebius to a *Bishop's charge*, in the fourth century, when by the concessions of all the opponents of Episcopacy this charge included several

* Mr. M'Leod's language in his Ecclesiastical Catechism.

*congregations*. The learned BINGHAM,* in his *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*,† observes, "The reader may find an *hundred* passages in Eusebius where he uses the word παροικία, (or *parish*,) when he speaks of those large and populous cities (*Rome*, *Antioch*, and *Alexandria*) which had *many particular churches* in them. The city of *Alexandria*, in the time (the fourth century) of ALEXANDER and ATHANASIUS, was divided into *several districts*, called *Laura*, in every one of which there was a *church*, with a Presbyter fixed upon it: and yet *all these* were but one παροικία, as ALEXANDER calls it in his circular Epistle against ARIUS." Until it can be proved that the word παροικία, in the primitive church, was invariably applied only to a single congregation, the argument drawn from it against a Bishop's charge extending beyond a single congregation, can have no weight. We dismiss the *name* of the Bishop's charge as of no consequence, as no way affecting either the nature or extent of his Episcopal jurisdiction.

Whether the ministers or congregations subject to a Bishop be more or less numerous; or whether instead of one Bishop being fixed to a particular diocese, the Bishops of a certain district should govern the church in common as a college of Bishops, are matters of expediency, of human policy, of ecclesiastical regulation; and do not affect the essential point of the *superiority* of Bishops to Presbyters in the powers of ordination and government. Timothy and Titus were evidently superior to the Elders or Presbyters of Ephesus and Crete; for the powers of ordination and government were expressly vested in them, and not in the Elders or Presbyters. And yet when Timothy and Titus, in order to *spread the gospel* as Evangelists, left the cities of Ephesus and Crete, they surely did not forfeit their superior powers. To

* I quote this learned Christian antiquarian with the more confidence, because I find you, in your "Letters on Frequent Communion," (p. 27) relying with confidence on his "collection and elucidation" of "authorities" with respect to an important practice in the *primitive* church.

† Book ix. chap. ii. sect 1.

make the existence of these powers absolutely dependent on their having been exclusively fixed to a certain district, would be absurd indeed.*

It was a rule in the primitive church, that the *office* and *characters* of Bishops and Presbyters extended over the whole church, and were not confined to any particular place. Wherever a Bishop or Presbyter travelled, he had a right to exercise his function on *just* and *proper* occasions. But it was also a rule, that the *ordinary exercise* of the office of a Bishop was confined to a particular district, and of an inferior minister to a particular congregation. No person will contend that a Minister ceases to be a Minister when he does not confine his functions to a particular congregation, but acts as a Missionary through various congregations and districts. And is it not strange that any person should contend that a Bishop ceases to be a Bishop, because the peculiar circumstances of the church may require his superintending distinct and distant churches? Who would think, for example, of seriously maintaining that the Roman Catholic Bishop in Maryland forfeits his distinctive Episcopal character, because the circumstance of there being no other Roman Catholic

* On this subject the opinion of one who has not been considered a high Churchman should have weight—Bishop HOADLY, in his "Defence of Episcopal Ordination," thus observes: (Chap. i.) "It is of *small importance* whether Timothy and Titus were *fixed Bishops*, properly so called, or not. Perhaps at the first plantation of churches there was no such necessity of *fixed Bishops* as was found afterwards; or perhaps at first the superintendency of such persons as Timothy and Titus was thought requisite in many different churches, as their several needs required. If so, their *office* certainly was the *same* in all churches to which they went; and *ordination* reserved to such as they were, persons superior to the settled Presbyters. But as to *Ephesus* and *Crete*, it is manifest that Timothy and Titus were to stay with the churches there as long as their presence was not more wanted at other places. And, besides, if they did leave these churches, there was as good reason that they *should return to them*, to perform the same office of *ordination*, when there was again occasion, as there was at first, why they should be sent by St. Paul to that purpose."

Bishop in this country requires him frequently to leave his residence and church in Baltimore, and to exercise his Episcopel functions in Pennsylvania, in New-York, and Massachusetts? Did circumstances in like manner prevent there being only one Protestant Episcopal Bishop in the United States, who would contend that he could not be a Bishop, because, instead of confining his Episcopal functions to the clergy and congregations of a certain district, he extended his superintendence over distant churches or districts? Yet, manifestly absurd as such a conclusion would be, the opponents of Episcopacy have founded a serious argument against the *superiority* of Timothy and Titus, from the circumstance that they were not *exclusively* fixed to the churches of Ephesus and Crete. Admit this argument, and you strip of their ministerial powers the numerous Missionaries who, instead of being exclusively fixed to a particular congregation, itinerate through the country.

In like manner circumstances may render it expedient that the Bishops of a particular country, instead of appropriating to each Bishop a particular district, should exercise their powers in common over the whole church. In this situation were the Bishops in Scotland on the abolition of Episcopacy. Deprived of their dioceses by the civil authority, they formed themselves into a college of Bishops, and exercised in common their Episcopal functions among their scattered flocks and ministers. To maintain that, because the arm of civil power stripped them of their dioceses, they forfeited their Episcopal prerogatives, when they still exercised these prerogatives (whenever they could do it with safety) among their scattered Presbyters and flocks, is as absurd as it is ungenerous. Yet no less a man than Dr. *Campbell*, in his *Ecclesiastical Lectures*, seriously contends that the Scotch Bishops, when they lost their dioceses, lost their Episcopal character. His able opponent, Bishop Skinner, of Aberdeen, very properly inquires—Did Dr. Campbell lose his ministerial character when he gave up his pastoral charge, and be-

came principal of Marishal College? And the inquiry may also be made—If persecution should deprive Presbyterian ministers of their congregations, and in this situation they were to constitute themselves into a Presbytery, and without particular pastoral charges, to minister, in common, to the spiritual wants of their scattered flocks, would they cease to be Presbyterian ministers?

There is an evident distinction between the *powers* of *office*, and the *exercise* of them. This last is styled *jurisdiction*. They are not only distinct but independent. The arm of power may deprive a Bishop of his jurisdiction, yet he still retains his Episcopal functions. The ecclesiastical authority may regulate this jurisdiction, may determine its *extent;* the particular ministers and congregations which it may include; the *manner* in which it may be exercised, whether in a particular district or diocese, or over the church at large. All these matters of *jurisdiction* are different from the powers of *office*. The jurisdiction of a Bishop may, from some particular circumstances, be confined to a single congregation, or be extended over an extensive province or country; his seat may be a small village, or a large and populous city; the civil magistrate may sink him into obscurity, and crush him with the arm of persecution, or may surround him with the splendour of worldly honours; a Dioclesian may hunt him to the stake, or a Constantine exalt him to the palace. These varying circumstances do not affect the *essentials* of his office, the *power* of ordaining Presbyters and Deacons, and of ruling them and their congregations when they are placed over any. The true point of contest between Episcopalians and their adversaries, is as to the *inherent* and *exclusive right* of Bishops to ordain Presbyters and Deacons, and to rule over them and their congregations; and not as to the *extent* or the *manner* of the *exercise* of this right, which must depend upon circumstances, and be matters of ecclesiastical regulation. The powers of a *Presbyter* are the same, whatever be the *name* or the *extent* of his pastoral charge. In like manner, "whether

the place in which the people reside who are under the *Bishop's* charge, be called a *parish* or a *diocese;* or whether his charge be of *larger or smaller extent*, can make no difference in the nature of Episcopacy. It is the *pre-eminence of office*, or the *superior authority* annexed to the Episcopal character that gives the true criterion of Prelacy."* According to St. Jerome, "Wherever a Bishop is, whether at Rome or at Eugubium, at Constantinople or at Rhegium, at Alexandria or at Tani, he has the same merit, and the same priesthood.† Neither the power of riches, nor the humility of poverty makes a Bishop higher or lower, but they are all *successors of the Apostles.*" Diocesan Bishops, for such confessedly were the Bishops in the time of St. Jerome *are all successors of the Apostles.*

5. Nor do Churchmen by any means consider it essential to Episcopacy, that the Bishop should exercise *sole* and *absolute* power in the church.

He alone indeed possesses the power of ordination; he only conveys, from the divine Head of the Church, the ministerial commission. But the *manner* and the *restrictions*, according to which this power is to be exercised, are subjects of ecclesiastical regulation. Accordingly, in the Church of England, as well in the Episcopal Church in this country, the Bishop does not ordain but with the concurrence of his Presbyters, and with their approbation, and that also of the Laity, to the religious and moral qualifications of the person ordained. In the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, "the *Bishops*, the *Clergy*, and the *Laity*" exercise jointly

* Bishop Skinner, of Aberdeen. Primitive Truth and Order, in answer to Dr. Campbell.

† The term *priesthood* is here used as an *appellative* to denote ministerial function. No argument can be drawn from the use of the term to prove that a Bishop is no more than a Priest. Since, whatever may be St. Jerome's opinion of their being originally the *same*, in *his time* they were confessedly *distinct*, according to the unanimous concession of the opponents of Episcopacy; and the Bishops of Constantinople, and of Rhegium, and of the other places were *diocesan Bishops.*

the power of *making ecclesiastical laws*. And in the Church of England the ecclesiastical laws made by the *Bishops* and *Clergy* in *convocation*, are not binding until they have received the assent of the *Laity*, of the King, Lords, and Commons. The rule of ecclesiastical legislation is thus settled by that able defender of Episcopacy, the "judicious" HOOKER. "The most natural and religious course in making laws is, that the *matter* of them be taken from the judgment of the *wisest* in those *things* which they are to *concern*. In *matters of God*, to set down a form of prayer, a solemn confession of the articles of the Christian faith, and ceremonies meet for the exercise of religion, it were unnatural not to think the *Pastors* and *Bishops* of our souls a great deal *more fit*, than men of secular trades and callings: howbeit, when all, which the *wisdom of all sorts* can do, is done for the devising of laws in the church, it is the *general consent of all* that giveth them the form and vigour of laws."* It is thought by some, that this joint association of the three orders, of Bishops, Clergy, and Laity, in making laws, has the sanction of apostolic and primitive usage; since in the memorable council at Jerusalem, there were the Apostles, Elders, and Brethren. And St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, in the third century, in all ecclesiastical matters acted with the advice of his Clergy and Laity. There may be others, on the contrary, among Episcopalians, who maintain that this mode of ecclesiastical legislation is not strictly apostolic and primitive. But the sense of the church is to be learnt from her acknowledged institutions and practice, and not from the opinions of individuals.

It is evident that the exercise of the power of ordination, with the approbation of the Presbyters and Laity, to the qualifications and character of the person ordained; the concurrent exercise of the powers of legislation by the Bishops, the Clergy, and the Laity; and the consultation of his Clergy

* Hooker. Ecclesiastical Polity, book viii. chap. iii. p. 344, Oxford edition.

and people, even in the executive and judicial measures of the Bishop, do not violate the *essentials* of Episcopacy. These essentials are, that the Bishop should have the *exclusive power of ordination*, and the *supreme* power of *governing* the church. Neither the Clergy nor the Laity presume to claim the power of ordination, or the supreme power of governing in the church: both which are peculiar to the Bishop.

6. There is no *particular mode* of *electing* or *appointing* Bishops essential to Episcopacy.

The *election* or *appointment* of a Bishop, and his ordination, or his receiving his Episcopal commission, are entirely distinct. As it is a maxim that the greater cannot be ordained by the less, nor those confer the power of ordination who have never received it, the ordination of a Bishop, the conferring on him the Episcopal authority, can be performed by *Bishops only*. But the *electing* or appointing of the person who is to be ordained Bishop is a matter of expediency and ecclesiastical regulation. In the primitive ages the Bishop was *elected* by the Clergy and people. But after the empire became Christian, the Bishops were generally appointed by the Emperor. Their *ordination* was always a *distinct* thing, and was performed by Bishops. In the Church of England the Bishops are virtually appointed by the King. In this country they are elected by the Clergy, and by the Laity represented by their delegates in convention. This appointment or election does not make them Bishops. Their *ordination* only, which is performed by Bishops, vests them with the Episcopal office. Obvious as this distinction is, there are found opponents of Episcopacy who seriously maintain, that because Bishops are appointed by the civil magistrate, or by the Clergy and people, their authority is of secular origin. As well might they contend, that because *Presbyterian* congregations elect or appoint their ministers, this election or appointment, and not ordination by the Presbytery, confers the Ministerial authority.

7. Episcopalians do *not* contend that in an *extensive* and

*unqualified* sense there is any form of church government of *divine right*.

Church government is often applied by Episcopal writers, in a *confined* sense, to the *orders of the ministry*. And in this *confined* signification, Episcopal government is of divine right. But in a more *extensive* sense, church government includes the particular organization by which ecclesiastical *power* is exercised, and discipline administered; and the rites and ceremonies by which public worship is conducted. In this *extensive* signification, Episcopalians maintain, that there is no precise form of church government of divine right. The organization of ecclesiastical authority, the forms of discipline, the rites and ceremonies of public worship, they maintain, are not laid down in scripture; and, "therefore, by common consent and authority, may be altered, abridged, enlarged, amended or otherwise disposed of, as may seem most convenient for the *edification of the people*."* The *single* point for which they contend is, that *Episcopacy* was instituted by Christ and his Apostles; that the three grades of ministers, *Bishops*, *Priests*, and *Deacons*, with their appropriate powers, are of "*divine and apostolical institution*."

The *government* of the church, therefore, is evidently not to be identified with its *ministry*. The *former*, considered as including discipline, rites and ceremonies, may be altered by human authority: the *latter* can only be altered by that divine authority which originally instituted it. If we change the distinctive grades and powers of the ministry, and take the power of ordination from that grade of ministers with whom it was originally vested, we make the ministry of human instead of divine authority; we destroy the connection between the ministry and its divine Head, Jesus Christ, whose commission alone can give it validity. But while Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, with the powers which they

* Preface to the Book of Common Prayer of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

respectively received from Christ and his Apostles, are preserved inviolate, the church possesses the right, according to Episcopalians, to create new officers; and to model discipline, rites and ceremonies, as may seem best for edification; provided there be no violation of any divine command or institution.

This principle, that in an extensive sense there is no form of church government in *all its parts* of divine right, is maintained by all Episcopalians. It is particularly vindicated by the celebrated HOOKER, in his learned "Ecclesiastical Polity." The Puritans maintained that "God hath delivered in scripture a complete, particular, immutable form of church polity." Of course they opposed the Church of England for including in her discipline and public services many things not expressly commanded by the word of God. In opposition to them, HOOKER contended, "to make *new* articles of faith and doctrine, no man thinketh it lawful; new laws of government, what commonwealth or church is there which maketh not either at one time or another?"* He contends, that as "external rites and ceremonies" do not affect the substance of the faith, "in such things, discretion may teach the church what is convenient;" and that in regard to them, "the church is no further tied unto scripture, than that against scripture nothing be admitted in the church."† Some Episcopal churches have incorporated in their regimen many ecclesiastical officers not known in other Episcopal churches, nor deemed essential by any. In regard to them HOOKER observes, "As for Deans, Prebendaries, Parsons, Vicars, Curates, Archdeacons, Chancellors, Officials, Commissaries, and such other like names," (he might have added Archbishops) "which being not found in holy scripture, we have been thereby, through some men's error, thought to allow of ecclesiastical degrees not known, nor ever heard of in the better ages of former times; all these are, in truth, but *titles* of *office*, whereunto partly ecclesiasti-

* Ecclesiastical Polity, book iii. sec. 10. † Sec. 3.

cal persons, and partly others are in sundry forms and conditions admitted, as the state of the church doth need; degrees of order" (by which he means the grades or degrees of the ministry,) "still continuing the *same* they were from the *first beginning*."* Whatsoever things the word of God hath neither commanded nor prohibited, the church possesses the right which every other *society* possesses, to prescribe and enjoin.

It is, therefore, a principle strictly Episcopal, received by all Churchmen, that the *particular organization of church government, matters of discipline, rites and ceremonies*, are not unalterably determined in scripture. In this *extensive* sense *there is no particular form of church government of divine right.* But it is unfair and uncandid to charge HOOKER, WHITGIFT, and other eminent divines who advocate and defend this principle, with giving up the claims of Episcopacy to divine institution. What are the *essentials of Episcopacy?* The "degrees of order"—*Bishops, Priests*, and *Deacons*, and their appropriate powers. And these HOOKER explicitly traces back to the institution of Christ and his Apostles. Alluding to a certain passage of scripture which he thinks improperly applied to prove the degrees of ecclesiastical order, HOOKER observes, "What orders of ecclesiastical persons there ought to be in the Church of Christ—we are not to learn from thence, but out of other parts of *holy scripture*, WHEREBY it clearly appeareth, that churches *apostolic* did know but *three degrees* in the power of *ecclesiastical order;* at the first *Apostles, Presbyters*, and *Deacons;* afterwards, *instead of Apostles*, BISHOPS, concerning whose order we are to speak in the seventh book."† And in yet more decisive terms he speaks—"I may securely, therefore, conclude, that there are in this day in the Church of England, no other than the same *degrees* of ecclesiastical orders, *Bishops, Presbyters*, and *Deacons*, which had their *beginning from*

* Ecclesiastical Polity, book v. sec. 78. † Sec. 78.

*Christ and his blessed Apostles themselves.*"* We find HOOKER further declaring—"It was the general received opinion of the ancient Christian world, that *Ecclesia est in episcopo*, the OUTWARD BEING of a CHURCH, consisted *in the having of a* BISHOP." "That so the ancient Fathers did think of *Episcopal regiment;* that they held this *order* as a thing received from the *blessed Apostles themselves, and authorized even from Heaven*, we may, perhaps, more easily prove, than obtain that they all shall grant it who see it proved." "And shall we think that James was made Bishop of Jerusalem, Evodius Bishop of the church of Antioch, the Angels in the churches of Asia Bishops; that Bishops every where were appointed to take away factions, contentions, and schisms, without some like direction and instigation of the Holy Ghost? Wherefore let us not fear to be herein bold and peremptory, that if any thing in the church's government, surely the *first institution of Bishops* was from *Heaven*, was even *of God;* the *Holy Ghost was the author of it.*"†

* These extracts are taken from the fifth book of HOOKER'S Ecclesiastical Polity, which was published before his death. Doubts have been raised by some, whether the three last books published after his death are genuine. The following statement appears in substance in the appendix to the Life of Hooker. Hooker wrote three books in addition to those published by himself. The rough draught of these books had been much defaced and dismembered by the persons into whose hands they had fallen. In this situation they were delivered by Archbishop Whitgift to Dr. Spencer, "to be made as perfect as they might be, by him, who both knew Mr. Hooker's hand-writing, and was best acquainted with his intentions." It appears improbable that there should be any material corruptions in these books, published by Dr. Spencer, "between whom and Hooker there was so friendly a friendship, that they *continually advised together* in all their studies, and *particularly in what concerned these books of Polity.*" The omissions and interpolations in some copies of these books do not respect Episcopacy, but some other matter. There could have been no inducement to interpolation on the subject of Episcopacy. For there is no sentiment advanced concerning it in his seventh book which is not contained in his fifth book, which is undoubtedly genuine; and in which he asserts, that "Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons had their beginning from Christ and his blessed Apostles."

† Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, book vii. sect. 5.

In like manner, WHITGIFT, in confuting the principle of the Puritans, that there ought not to be any thing in the church's government or worship which is not prescribed in the word of God, maintained that "there is no certain kind of government or discipline prescribed to the church, but that the same may be altered as the profit of the churches require." Still he maintained all that is ESSENTIAL to Episcopacy, the *superiority of Bishops* to Presbyters and Deacons by *divine institution.* In a letter to *Beza*, Archbishop WHITGIFT observes—"We make no doubt but that the EPISCOPAL DEGREE which we bear, is an institution APOSTOLICAL and DIVINE; and so hath always been held by a continual course of times from the *Apostles*' to this very age of ours." "And what *Aaron* was to his *sons* and to the *Levites*, this the *Bishops* were to the *Priests* and *Deacons;* and so esteemed of the Fathers to be by DIVINE INSTITUTION."*

It is evidently uncandid and unfair, therefore, to urge, that because HOOKER and other divines maintain what is, in fact, a *church principle*, that in an *extensive* sense there is no precise form of church government in all its parts prescribed in the word of God; they, therefore, give up Episcopacy as a divine institution. They expressly maintain, in the strongest language, all that is essential to Episcopacy, that Bishops are superior to Presbyters and Deacons by "*divine* and *apostolical* institution." It is equally uncandid and unfair to urge, from particular expressions of some of the Reformers at an early period of the Reformation, that the Church of England was not constituted upon the principle that Episcopacy was instituted by Christ and his Apostles. Such were the arbitrary pretensions of Henry VIII. and such, unhappily, for *some time*, the submission of some of the English Reformers to those pretensions, that they were led to submit to Erastian principles, which, viewing the church merely as a creature of the state, tended to subvert entirely her spiritual authority. Happily, however, the Church of England was not founded

* Strype's Life of Whitgift, p. 460

on these principles, and those of the Reformers who once avowed, finally disclaimed, them. We want no stronger evidence of this, than the fact, that the Church of England, at the Reformation, preserved the Episcopal succession.* She formed all her public offices on the principles that there are the three orders, of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; that

* The contemptible *story* of the *Nag's head ordination* is sometimes urged by the opponents of Episcopacy, to invalidate the Episcopal succession of the Church of England. According to this *story*, Archbishop Parker, in the reign of Elizabeth, was consecrated privately at the *Nag's head tavern*, by persons who were not Bishops. It ought, in justice, to be mentioned, that the candid opponents of Episcopacy disdain to press into their cause this story, entirely destitute of proof, and which was invented by the Papists to injure the Church of England. Its falsehood has been exposed by many writers, and especially by Bishop BURNET, who will not be accused of being unduly partial to the Episcopal cause. "This story was not thought of, Bishop Burnet observes, until forty years after" the period of Bishop Parker's consecration. It was then contradicted by "the old Earl of Nottingham, who had been at the consecration, declared it was at Lambeth, and described all the circumstances of it, and satisfied all reasonable men that it was according to the form of the Church of England. The *registers*, both of the See of Canterbury, and of the *Records of the Crown*, do all fully agree with his relation. And above all other testimonies, the *original instrument* of Archbishop Parker's consecration lies still among his other papers in the library of Corpus Christi College, at Cambridge, which I saw and read. It is as manifestly an original writing as any that I have ever had in my hands. I have put it in the collection for the more full discovery of the *impudence of the fiction*." Burnet's History of the Reformation, book ii. p. 402. It is indeed incredible, that so important, and at that period, so particularly interesting an event as the consecration of an Archbishop of Canterbury should have been privately and illegally performed, and yet that no discovery of it should be made until forty years after; and that in the mean time the ordination should be sanctioned as valid by all the public registers, and by various acts of Parliament. If, in opposition to these striking facts, we doubt the regularity of Archbishop Parker's ordination, how easy will it be to throw doubt on the best authenticated events!*

* The learned Dr. Lingard, the standard historian of the Romish church, admits in his Universal History the Nag's head story to be a fable; and subsequently, in four letters to a Romanist, defends this admission by the clearest and most incontestible proofs.—ED.

these "orders" were "constituted" by Almighty God, by "his divine providence," and by his "Holy Spirit;"* and that the Bishops alone have the power of ordination.†

When, therefore, the opponents of Episcopacy urge that the *Reformers* of the Church of England, and many of her most eminent divines, did not maintain that Episcopacy was the institution of Christ and his Apostles, Episcopalians have only to reply—The sense of the Church of England, as to Episcopacy, is to be learnt from her public offices, and from her practice, and not from the sentiments of individuals. Will you allow that the Church of Scotland is anti-Calvinistic in her doctrines, because many of her most eminent divines are confessedly so. The Church of England receives no one as a minister who has not been Episcopally ordained. Some of the Reformers entertained, at a certain period, lax notions on the subject of Episcopacy. But they were, at the same time, equally erroneous in many of their opinions concerning some of the fundamental doctrines of the gospel. If CRANMER's sentiments were at one time favourable to the *equality* of Bishops and Priests, so were they also to transubstantiation. But he renounced his errors on both these points. You will not dispute Bishop Burnet's authority, who asserts, "In CRANMER's paper some singular opinions of his about the nature of ecclesiastical offices will be found; but as they are delivered by him with all possible modesty, so *they were not established as the doctrine of the church*, but

* The declarations of the prayers in the ordination offices.

† The conduct of Archbishop GRINDAL, who, in the reign of Elizabeth, granted a license to preach to *John Morrison* a *Presbyterian* divine, is often triumphantly adduced as a proof that the Church of England admits the validity of Presbyterian ordination. Is it possible that the irregular conduct of an Archbishop, "who was thought too gentle and remiss in his management, and to whom the privy council wrote to complain of the relaxation of discipline,"* should be urged by men of sense and candour as evidence that the Church of England admits what all her public offices and her general practice disclaim!

* Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. p. 571.

*laid aside* as particular conceits of his own; and it seems that afterwards he changed his own opinion. For he subscribed the book which was soon after set out, which was directly contrary to those opinions."* He published also a Catechism, in which, according to Bishop Burnet, "he fully owns the divine institution of Bishops and Priests."†

It is useless then (the Episcopalian may continue to address his opponents) to dispute, whether some of the divines of the English Church did not acknowledge that there is no precise form of government in all its parts of divine right. This is not bringing the matter to a point; "it is not taking the question by the proper handle." The only essential question is, Were Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, with their distinctive and subordinate powers, instituted by Christ and his Apostles? And on this question will you acknowledge with the Church of England, and the Episcopal Church in this country, that "it is evident unto all men diligently reading holy scriptures and ancient authors, that, from the Apostles' times, there have been these orders of Ministers, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons?"‡ Will you maintain, with these

* History of the Reformation, vol. i. p. 289.

† History of the Reformation, vol. ii. p. 71. An extract from this Catechism appears in Dr. Chandler's "Appeal further defended," (p. 63.) In this tract, and in his "Appeal defended," will be found a full vindication of the Reformers from the charge of not maintaining the divine institutions of Episcopacy.

‡ The Church of England, and the Protestant Episcopal Church not only assert, that those now called Bishops and Presbyters are distinct, but, in fact, exalt a Bishop above a Presbyter by a *solemn ordination*. There can be no doubt then that in their judgment the offices are distinct. Why then, it may be asked, do they appoint to be read, in the ordering of Bishops, some portions of scripture which are considered as designating not those who are now strictly called Bishops, but the order of Presbyters, to whom in the New Testament the title Bishop is often given? The answer may be—These passages describe the general duties of pastors, as *overseers* of souls; and may, therefore, as an admonition to duty, be with propriety applied, either to the *Presbyter*, as the *overseer* of a particular congregation, or to the *Bishop* (strictly so called) as an *overseer* of the church at large.

churches, that "Almighty God, by his divine providence and Holy Spirit appointed *divers orders* of ministers in his church;" and that these orders are "Bishops, Priests, and Deacons?"* Will you adopt the *practice* of those churches, and acknowledge none as "lawful ministers" among you "who have not had Episcopal consecration or ordination?"† Will you maintain, with CRANMER, who adopted those ordination services, the "divine institution of Bishops and Priests!" Will you assert, with WHITGIFT, "that the Episcopal degree is an institution apostolical and divine?" Will you allow, with HOOKER, that "Bishops, Priests, and Deacons had their beginning from Christ and his blessed Apostles?"‡ And "that besides these *last times*, which, for insolency, pride, and egregious contempt of all good order are the worst, there are *none* wherein ye can truly affirm, that the *complete form* of your discipline, or the *substance* thereof, was practised?"§ Will you adopt the reasoning of CHILLINGWORTH in his celebrated tract, in which he demonstrates "the apostolical institution of Episcopacy?" Will you assert, with STILLINGFLEET, that "they who go about to *unbishop* Timothy and Titus, may as well *unscripture the Epistles* that were written to them, and make *them* only some *particular* and *occasional* writings, as make Timothy and Titus to have been only some *particular* and *occasional* officers;"‖ and that "we have no greater assurance that these Epistles were written by St. Paul, than that there were Bishops to succeed the Apostles in the care and government of churches?" Will you maintain, with a Bishop of our own country, who has been unjustly considered as aiding your cause, that "there having been an *Episcopal power* originally lodged by *Jesus Christ* with his *Apostles*, and by them exercised

* Preface to Ordination Service. † Ibid.

‡ Ecclesiastical Polity, book v. sect. 79.

§ Hooker. Preface to Ecclesiastical Polity, sect. 4.

‖ Stillingfleet's (the author of the Irenicum) Charge on the duties and Rights of the Clergy, p. 8.

generally in person, but sometimes by delegation (as in the instances of *Timothy* and *Titus*,) the same was *conveyed* by them before their decease to *one pastor* in each *church*, which generally comprehended all the Christians in a city and a convenient surrounding district? Thus were created the *apostolic* successors."* Will you maintain, with the same Bishop, that "it seemed good to the Apostles to appoint some of these with *supereminent* commission, of which there were instances in *Timothy* and *Titus;* and the persons so appointed have *handed down their commission through the different ages of the church*? This is the *originally constituted* order."†

If the non-Episcopalian will make these concessions, and will hold this language, he fairly gives up his cause. He maintains all that the Episcopalian could wish. And we shall be glad to hear on what grounds he will justify his rejection of the "originally constituted order," and of degrees of the ministry who had their "beginning from Christ and his blessed Apostles."

8. The difference of opinion among Episcopalians, with respect to *cases of necessity*, does not affect the *essentials* of Episcopacy.

These *essentials* are, that by the institution of Christ and his Apostles, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons have distinct powers; and that ordination, and the supreme power of government are peculiar to Bishops. But a question arises in respect to cases of necessity. Are Presbyters justified in ordaining, when *ordination by Bishops cannot be had*? Some

* Case of the Episcopal churches considered, p. 23. The Episcopal opinion there stated "is to be understood as the author's own." Collection of Essays on Episcopacy, p. 175. In the first named pamphlet the author advocated a "*temporary departure*" from Episcopacy, *on the plea of necessity*, on the supposition that "ordination by Bishops could not be had." Whatever may be thought of the *validity* of this plea, it has been asserted by many who have favoured the highest claims of Episcopacy.

† Bishop White's Sermon before the General Convention.

advocates of Episcopacy have maintained, that no case of necessity can justify Presbyters in assuming a power which they never received from the divine Head of the Church.* While others have maintained, that, provided the general obligation of Episcopacy be acknowledged, God will mercifully accept the ministrations of those Presbyterially ordained, where ordination by Bishops cannot be had.

However plausible the *plea of necessity* may have been in some places in the early stages of the Reformation, it would be difficult to find a place where such a plea could now be maintained. The question, therefore, is now more curious than useful. The validity of such a plea may, however, be admitted in perfect consistency with the highest Episcopal claims, on the ground, that as the public exercises of the ministry are essential to the preservation of religion, it may please God, where a duly authorized ministry cannot be had, to accept and bless the ministrations of those who have not received their commission by regular transmission from the divine Head of the Church, through the appointed channel. To assert that the admission of this plea is to give up the point that Episcopal ordination is prescribed by Christ and his Apostles, would be absurd. The plea of necessity essentially involves an acknowledgement of the *obligation* of the institution, which is neglected or violated. Reasons that might vindicate a *temporary departure*, would not justify a *final abrogation*. Some of the highest Churchmen, and ablest advocates of Episcopacy, who have maintained that "Bishops, Priests, and Deacons had their beginning from Christ and his blessed Apostles;"† that "the *power of ordaining* hath always been *peculiar* unto Bishops;" that "it hath not been heard of that Presbyters were ever authorized to ordain;"‡ that "the *first institution* of *Bishops* was from *heaven*, was

* The fallacy of this plea of necessity is very forcibly urged and maintained, by a writer with the signature of "Eusebius," in the Churchman's Magazine, for February, 1807, published in New-Haven, Connecticut.

† Hooker. Ecclesiastical Polity, book v. sec. 78. ‡ Book vii. sec. 6.

*even of God;*" have yet maintained that "where the church must needs have some ordained, and neither hath, nor *can have possibly* a Bishop to ordain; in case of such *necessity*, the ordinary *institution of God* hath given often times, and may give place."* But these cases of *inevitable necessity* alone excepted, *none may ordain but only Bishops.*"†

On this subject, the remarks of a learned and judicious Commentator on the offices of ordination are well worthy of attention.‡

"But some will object that this" (the universally owned principle, that Bishops only could ordain) "will deprive divers foreign churches (where they have no Bishops) of a lawful ministry, because their Ministers have no ordinations but by Presbyters. To which I shall only say, that the first Presbyter who presumed to ordain had no such power given him, and *so could not rightly convey that which he never received.* There is no precedent in scripture of mere Presbyters ordaining alone: and such ordinations would have been declared *null* in the primitive ages; yea, for 1500 years together no such were allowed. But the fairest plea is, that some of these churches were forced, by dire necessity, to this irregularity, by the obstinate refusal of the Popish Bishops to ordain any that were for Reformation, so that they must either have such a Clergy as they could have, or have none to officiate in the Protestant way. To which I reply, that where this necessity was *real*, and *while* it was so (as, perhaps, it might be in some places at first) *it will go far to excuse them.*" "For those of the foreign reformed churches, who highly value the *Episcopal order*, wish for Bishops, but are, by persecution and violence, kept from that happiness; we pity them, and pray for them, and hope God will excuse this defect till they can remedy it.§ But we are thankful to that Providence which allows us to keep up the

* Book vii. sec. 14. † Sec. 14.

‡ Dean COMBER, in his Companion to the Temple, vol. ii. p. 190.

§ This was the prayer of the SYNOD OF DORT for themselves. See page 95 and 96.

primitive orders in a due subordination, and to have a *right* and truly canonical ministry in this well constituted church, the exact transcript of the primitive, and the *glory* of the Reformation."

9. The difference of opinion among Episcopalians, as to the necessity of repeating all baptisms performed by those who have not received Episcopal ordination, does not affect the *essentials* of Episcopacy.

It is a principle in which all Churchmen agree, that none have authority to baptize but those who are lawfully ordained; and the church receives none as lawfully ordained, but *those who have received Episcopal consecration or ordination.* Here then is an agreement in the *essentials* of Episcopacy. A difference of opinion, however, arises as to a *subordinate* point. The Church of Rome, on the principle that none can be saved who are not baptized, allows, and always has allowed of lay baptism. Are these baptisms, and those performed by ministers not Episcopally ordained, valid; or are they to be repeated as being totally invalid?

On this question Churchmen divide into two classes. Both classes agree that these baptisms are *irregular*, performed without *due authority;* and that both the administrators and recipients (except on the plea of "unavoidable ignorance or involuntary error") incur *great guilt.* One class however contend that, as non-Episcopal baptisms, administered with water, in the name of the Trinity, are not deficient in *form* and in *matter*, but only in regular authority, this deficiency is supplied when the person thus baptized is received into communion with the authorized ministry by confirmation or the Lord's Supper; and that, therefore, non-Episcopal baptisms are not to be repeated. *Fieri non debet—factum valet. It ought not to be done—when done, it is valid.* The general practice of the Church of England, it is believed, has been regulated by this opinion, which has been embraced by many of her most eminent divines, the ablest advocates of Episcopacy.

Another class of divines contend that the *form* the name of the Trinity, the *matter* water, and the *authority* a regular commission from the divine Head of the Church, are equally essential in the administration of baptism; and that, of course, where this regular commission is wanting in the administrator, the baptism is invalid. This opinion also has been embraced and defended by many distinguished divines and laymen of the Church of England, particularly by Lawrence, in his treatises, entitled, "Lay Baptism Invalid."* The venerable Episcopal Church of Scotland, it is believed, has regulated her practice by this opinion.

The difference of opinion on this subject, it is evident, does not affect the *essentials* of Episcopacy. Both classes of divines agree that no person has regular *authority* to administer baptism but a *lawful* Minister, one who has received "Episcopal consecration or ordination." The difference of opinion arises on the question—How is the *deficiency of authority* in non-Episcopal baptisms to be supplied? The one contend that this deficiency is supplied when the person thus baptized receives Confirmation or the Lord's supper from the Bishop or a *lawful* Minister: and the other contend, that the person has never received the sacrament of baptism, which he must, therefore, receive from an administrator duly authorized.

But the assertion has been often triumphantly made, that according to the last of these opinions, there have been *Ministers*, and even *Bishops* in the Episcopal Church, who have never received Christian Baptism. There is an easy and obvious answer, which should instantly silence the triumphant ridicule with which this assertion has been generally advanced. The Episcopal Church, and the Church of England have never explicitly sanctioned the opinion on which this assertion is founded. On the contrary, both churches repeatedly have at least *admitted* the principle, that a non-Episcopal baptism, deficient only in the authority

* Also Dr. Waterland in his masterly argument with Kelsal.—Editor

of the administrator, and not in the *essence* of the sacrament, which is, *water in the name of the Trinity*, receives the seal of *authority*, and becomes *complete* and *valid*, when the person thus baptized receives Confirmation or the Lord's supper from those duly authorized. At the same time, these churches do not prevent their ministers and members from acting on the contrary opinion. But admitting this opinion to be well founded; admitting that a person non-Episcopally baptized has not received regular Christian baptism; he is not, therefore, absolutely disqualified from holding a ministerial commission.

The only thing *absolutely essential* in the office of a minister, is a *valid commission*. "He must be called of God as was Aaron." Literary, theological, religious and moral qualifications, though necessary to the correct, respectable and successful discharge of the ministry, are not *essential* to the *validity* of its acts. Judas was an Apostle, though he was "a traitor and had a devil." "Sacraments received by faith, and rightly, are effectual, because of Christ's *institution and promise*, although they be ministered by *evil* men."* The contrary principle would throw the church into perpetual disorder, and agitate the breast of Christians with constant uncertainty and fears. No man can penetrate the heart. If genuine piety, therefore, be necessary to the validity of ministerial acts, Christians can never be *absolutely* certain that the sacraments they receive are valid. The acts of a wicked magistrate, the decisions of a corrupt judge are valid, *because of his commission*. The acts of an unholy minister of the church are valid, for the same reason, *because of his commission*—"because of Christ's institution and promise." If, therefore, the "unworthiness of a minister" does not nullify his ministerial acts, neither can his want of regular Christian baptism: for it will not surely be contended that regular Christian baptism is more necessary to the ministry than holiness of heart and life."†

* Article twenty-sixth of the Church of England.

† Besides, a person may be *ex officio* member of a body into which

Presbyterians are as much interested in maintaining this opinion as Episopalians. Lay baptism, it is well known, has always been practised in the Church of Rome, and was allowed in the Church of England for some time after the Reformation. Is it not, therefore, highly probable that many of the Reformers, as well as those Presbyters of the Church of England whom the Presbyterian Church acknowledges as ministers, and from whom she derives her ministry, had only received lay baptism? But the Presbyterian Church declares, that "baptism may not be dispensed by any but a minister of the word lawfully ordained."* She ranks the "*lawful calling*" of the minister, with *water* and the *name of the Trinity*, which are *essentials* of baptism.† Many persons, therefore, may have been ministers in Presbyterian churches who have never received regular Christian baptism.‡ Presbyterians are as much interested as Episcopalians in maintaining, that "a lawful calling," a *valid commission* is alone *absolutely essential* to the validity of ministerial acts.

Beware, therefore, sir, how you rashly aim against Episcopalians weapons which may be made to recoil upon yourself.

---

## LETTER XI.

SIR,

I HAVE thus stripped Episcopacy of some of those appendages, in the demolition of which its opponents have exerted all their powers, through the vain hope that these demolished,

has not been introduced in the ordinary way; as in the case of the President of the Senate of the United States.—EDITOR.

* Presbyterian Confession of Faith, chap. xxvii. sect. 4.

† Presbyterian Confession of Faith, chap. xxviii. sect. 2.

‡ And more than this, doubts have been suggested, whether CALVIN ever received ordination. It is said that Beza, in his life of Calvin, regards it as very doubtful. Here then is a knotty point worthy of the energies of the editor of the Christian's Magazine. Alas! if it should appear that the great founder of the Presbyterian churches was only a Layman!

Episcopacy itself would fall. The candid reader, however, will perceive that these are only appendages of Episcopacy, and that on some *subordinate points* Episcopalians may differ, while they agree in all the essentials.

What now, sir, becomes of the assertion that there are "material differences among Episcopalians on their favourite theme?"* Do you suppose your readers weak enough to believe, that because differences subsist among Episcopalians on some subordinate points, they cannot agree in essential principles? Are there no common and essential principles of Calvinism, because many important differences subsist among the various sects of Calvinists; high Calvinists and moderate Calvinists, Supra-lapsarians and Sub-lapsarians, Baxterians, Hopkensians, Antinomians? Is Calvinism unfounded in scripture, because there are confusion and mutual contradictions among Calvinists "when they attempt to found their system on the scriptures?"† Never triumph that some Episcopalians rely, in support of their system, on irrelevant passages of scripture, when Mr. M'Leod, before your eyes, endeavours to prove the *divine appointment* of "Presbyterial order" from the text, Rev. iii. 22. "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches."‡

The essential and characteristic principles of Episcopacy are—that there are *three* grades of ministers instituted by *Christ and his Apostles;* and that the *first grade*, in addition to the common ministerial powers, possess the sole power of *ordination*, with the right of exercising supreme authority over the *congregations and ministers* who may be subject to them.

Let us bring these principles to the test of SCRIPTURE. Let any candid man, throwing aside preconceived opinions, open the sacred writings. He finds that from the first, there have been *three grades* in the ministry. Under the Jewish dispensation there were the *High Priest*, *Priests*, and *Levites*.§

* Christian's Magazine, p. 100. † p. 101.

‡ Ecclesiastical Catechism, p. 31.

§ Considerable ingenuity and learning has sometimes been displayed in

When CHRIST appeared to establish the gospel dispensation, there were subordinate to him the great *High Priest* of our profession, the *Apostles*,* and the *seventy*.† After his ascension, we find the ministry constituted under the three grades of *Apostles*, *Elders*, or *Presbyters*‡ sometimes called *Bishops*, and *Deacons*.§ In the churches which the Apostles founded, we still discover *three grades*. In Ephesus and Crete there were *Timothy* and *Titus*, *Elders* or *Presbyters*|| sometimes also called Bishops, and *Deacons*.¶

That these grades were distinct and subordinate, and that the power of ordination and the supreme power of governing the church were vested in the *first grade*, are as plain as *scripture* facts can make them. It will be conceded that Christ, while on earth, and not the Apostles or the seventy, exercised supreme authority, and conferred the ministerial commission. It will also be conceded that the *Apostles*, and not the Elders or Deacons, exercised the powers of ordination and government. And the candid inquirer who opens the Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, will not hesitate to pronounce that they were the *supreme governors* of those churches, and succeeded the Apostles, not in their miraculous and peculiar powers as Apostles, but in the ordinary powers of *ordination* and government. They are to "ordain elders in every

proving, that the Christian Church was formed on the model of the synagogue and not of the temple; and that, therefore, there being three orders in the Jewish ministry furnishes no presumption that there would be the same distinction and subordination in the Christian ministry. The chief support of this opinion is a fallacious argument founded on the identity of *names* between the ministers of the gospel and some officers of the synagogue. It is surely highly improbable that Christ would constitute the ministry of his gospel on the model of the synagogue, which was only of *human* institution, and not on that of the temple, which was of divine appointment—Episcopalians, however, lay no stress on arguments from this source. The constitution of the Christian ministry is to be determined by the evidence of the New Testament only.

* Luke vi. 12, 13. † Luke x. 1. ‡ Acts xiv. 23.
§ Acts vi. 1 Tim. iii. 8. || 1 Tim. v. 1, 19. Titus i. 5.
¶ 1 Tim. iii. 8.

city;"* they are "to lay hands suddenly on no man;"† they are to "set in order the things that are wanting;"‡ "against an Elder they are not to receive an accusation, but before two or three witnesses;"§ "a heretic" they are to "reject after the first and second admonition."‖ Would not every person of candour and common sense conclude from this language, that *Timothy* and *Titus* succeeded the Apostles in the powers of ordaining and governing the church? Would not common sense revolt at the supposition that they were on a level with the Elders or Presbyters, whom they were to *ordain*, whom they were to *rebuke*, whom they were to *judge* and *govern*? There must have been Elders at Ephesus before Timothy was sent there. At least five years before St. Paul wrote his Epistles to Timothy, he sent from Miletus to Ephesus for "the elders of the church."¶ Would not common sense then reject the supposition that these Elders possessed the power of ordination? Why should Timothy be sent there vested with this power; and the directions concerning the exercise of it, and of the power of governing addressed to him, and no mention made of the Elders or Presbyters possessing these powers? If they had possessed the powers of ordination and government, what need could there have been that Timothy should be sent there to do what could as well have been done by the Elders themselves? In like manner, on the supposition that there were Elders at Crete, possessed of the powers of ordination and government, why should Titus be sent there to exercise these powers? And if there were no Elders before St. Paul left Titus there, why did he not ordain Elders, and vest them with the powers of ordination and government, instead of vesting them in Titus?

While our Saviour was upon earth, there were subordinate to him the great High Priest of our profession, the Apostles, and the Seventy; and he alone commissioned to the ministry.

* Titus i. 5. † 1 Tim. v. 22. ‡ Titus i. 5.
§ 1 Tim. v. 19. ‖ Titus iii. 10. ¶ Acts xx. 17.

After his ascension three grades of the ministry still subsisted in the Apostles, the Elders or Presbyters, and the Deacons; and the Apostles alone ordained. These facts would sanction the presumption that three grades of the ministry would still continue, and that the first grade, as before, would exercise the power of ordination. And *scripture* testimony proves that in Ephesus and Crete there were *Timothy* and *Titus* the *superior officers* of those churches, the *Elders*, and *Deacons;* and that *Timothy* and *Titus* only were commissioned to *ordain*.

Here then are palpable facts, level to the comprehension of every one, and on which every candid inquirer may securely rest. Ingenuity may obscure or pervert them; but what is there around which ingenuity cannot cast the shades of perplexity and doubt?

The cardinal principles on which Episcopacy rests are not only established by the sacred writings, but are acknowledged and received by the Standards of Doctrine of the Presbyterian churches. In the chain of reasoning that supports Episcopacy, the first principle is, that they who minister in Christ's Church must have an *external commission*. Christ, the divine Head of the Church, is the source of all power in it. The ministers of his Church, as stewards of the mysteries of God, as dispensers of his word and sacraments, as ambassadors of God, can act only from a divine commission. No human power can authorize a man to act in the name of God—"He must be called of God as was Aaron."* The adorable Saviour of men, the "word made flesh," entered not on his priestly office until he was solemnly commissioned from above. If then the Son of God, in whom "dwelt the fulness of the Godhead;" if he who possessed "the Spirit without measure," "glorified not himself to be made an High Priest, but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee;"† if he refrained from that priestly office to which he was from all eternity called, until

* Heb. v. 4. † Heb. v. 5.

the visible descent of the Holy Ghost, and a voice from heaven conferred on him an *external commission*, how impious in a frail mortal presuming on internal gifts and graces to exercise the ministry, until authorized by an *external call*, by a divine commission! This principle of the necessity of an external commission to the ministry, you, sir, will not controvert. The Standards of the Presbyterian churches declare that *none but ministers of the word*, LAWFULLY ORDAINED, *have authority to dispense the sacraments*.* The necessity of an *external commission*, that a person must be *ordained* before he can be a lawful minister, is a principle maintained by all sound Presbyterians. And the text of scripture quoted in support of it is that relied on by Episcopalians—"No man taketh this honour to himself but he that is called of God as was Aaron."

This external commission for the ministry must be conferred by those who have received authority, by *regular succession*, from Christ, the great Head of the Church. On this point there can be no dispute between Episcopalians and Presbyterians. Both agree that the power of ordination rests with those with whom Christ originally placed it. Christ evidently vested the power of ordination not in the community of Christians, but in the Apostles and their successors. "As my Father sent me, so send I you. Lo, I am with you alway even to the end of the world." This promise of Christ evidently ensures a ministry continued by *succession* to the end of the world. The Apostles, and not the community of Christians, exercised the power of ordination. None ministered in the church as *ordinary officers*† but those who had been solemnly set apart by the laying on of hands. This power of *ordination*, of setting apart to the

* Presbyterian Confession of Faith, chap. xxvii. sect. 4, and the scripture proofs.

† *Teaching* was in the Apostolic age a miraculous gift, and may have been exercised by those who never were ordained. But in the present day this will not justify any Christian in assuming the ministerial function, unless he can display miraculous gifts.

ministry, of conferring the ministerial commission, must be derived by *succession*, from the great head of the Church, the only source of authority. The man who claims, in any other way than by *succession*, this power of ordination, can make good his claim, and justify it from the charge of usurpation, only by exhibiting *miraculous* gifts, which alone are the proofs of an immediate commission from heaven.

This doctrine then, of a regular conveyance of the power of ordination by *uninterrupted succession* from Christ and his Apostles, is as necessary to the support of Presbyterian as of Episcopal principles. The real difference between Episcopalians and Presbyterians is, not as to the conveyance of the power of ordination by *succession*, but as to the particular *grade* of ministers through which the line of succession is to be traced; whether through Bishops or Presbyters. The doctrine of *succession* was maintained in England by the *Presbyterian* divines against the *Independents;* and is still asserted by all real and consistent *Presbyterians.**

Whatever ridicule may be cast on the doctrine of uninterrupted succession, Presbyterians as well as Episcopalians should cling to it as the sheet anchor that is to prevent the church from being overwhelmed by secular encroachment. It is the only rampart against those assaults of self-constituted teachers, which would strip the church of her divine authority, shake her from her foundation on the Rock of ages, and place her on the tottering basis of popular caprice, of human authority. Equally interested with myself, sir, in

* It is ably vindicated by the ingenious Dr. LATHROP, of Springfield, (Massachusetts) in two discourses, entitled, "Christ's Warning to the Churches," &c. His reasoning on the subject appears in the "Collection of Essays on Episcopacy," (p. 95.) This doctrine of succession is maintained by Mr. M'LEOD, in his Ecclesiastical Catechism, (p. 28.) "Christ has promised his presence with his ministers, continued to the end of the world by *succession*." And Mr. M'LEOD deserves credit for quoting, in proof of this doctrine, a text which is strictly to the point—"Lo I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." Matt. xxviii. 20.

maintaining this doctrine, I trust you will peruse with satisfaction the pungent and irrefragable reasoning by which the celebrated LAW defends it in his "first letter to the Bishop of Bangor."* "If there be not a succession of persons authorized from Christ to send others to act in his name, then both Episcopal and Presbyterian teachers are equally usurpers, and as mere laymen as any at all. For there cannot be any other difference between the clergy and laity, but as the one hath authority derived from Christ, to perform offices, which the other hath not. But this authority can be no otherwise had, than by an uninterrupted succession of men from Christ, empowered to qualify others. For if the succession be once broke, people must either go into the ministry of their own accord, or be sent by such as have no more power to send others than to go themselves. And, my Lord, can these be called ministers of Christ, or received as his ambassadors? Can they be thought to act in his name, who have no authority from him? If so, your lordship's servant might ordain and baptize to as much purpose as your lordship: for it could only be objected to such actions, that they had no authority from Christ. And if there be no succession of ordainers from him, every one is equally qualified to ordain. My Lord, I should think it might be granted me, that the administering of a sacrament is an action we have no right to perform, considered either as men, gentlemen, or scholars, or members of a civil society: who then can have any authority to interpose, but he that has it from Christ? and how that can be had from him without a succession of men from him, is not easily conceived.

* LAW addressed "three letters" to the Bishop of Bangor, in defence of church authority, which are republished in the "Scholar Armed." There is not an objection which ingenuity can raise against church authority in general, and particularly against the various principles of Episcopacy, which is not refuted in these letters. As a specimen of keen, yet delicate satire, of perspicuous, forcible, and profound reasoning, they stand unrivalled.

"It is a plain and obvious truth, that no man, or number of men, considered as such, can any more make a priest, or commission a person to officiate in Christ's name, as such, than he can enlarge the means of grace, or add a new sacrament for the conveyance of spiritual advantages. The ministers of Christ are as much positive ordinances as the sacraments; and we might as well think, that sacraments not instituted by him, might be means of grace, as those pass for his ministers who have no authority from him.

"Once more, all things are either in common in the Church of Christ, or they are not: if they are, then every one may preach, baptize, ordain, &c. If all things are not thus common, but the administering of the sacraments and ordination, &c. are offices appropriated to particular persons; then I desire to know, how, in this present age, or any other since the Apostles, Christians can know their respective duties, or what they may or may not do, with respect to the several acts of church-communion, if there be no uninterrupted succession of authorized persons from Christ: for till authority from Christ appears, to make a difference between them, we are all alike, and any one may officiate as well as another. To make a jest therefore of the uninterrupted succession, is to make a jest of ordination, to destroy the sacred character, and make all pretenders to it as good as those that are sent by Christ.

"If there be no uninterrupted succession, then there are no authorized ministers from Christ; if no such ministers, then no Christian sacraments; if no Christian sacraments, then no Christian covenant, whereof the sacraments are the stated and visible seals.

"There is an absolute necessity of a strict succession of authorized ordainers from the apostolical times, in order to constitute a Christian priest. For since a commission from the Holy Ghost is necessary for the exercise of this office, no one now can receive it, but from those who have derived their authority in a true succession from the Apostles.

"The clergy have their commission from the Holy Ghost: the power of conferring this commission of the Holy Ghost was left with the Apostles: therefore the present clergy cannot have the same commission, or call, but from an order of men who have successively conveyed his power from the Apostles to the present time. So that, my lord, I shall beg leave to lay it down as a plain, undeniable, Christian truth, that the order of the clergy is an order of as necessary obligation as the sacraments, and as unalterable as the holy scriptures; the same Holy Ghost being as truly the author and founder of the priesthood, as the institutor of the sacraments, or the inspirer of those divine oracles."

The doctrine then, of "the presence of Christ with his ministers, continued to the end of the world by succession;" of the *power of ordination* thus *successively* transmitted in the church to the end of the world, is a doctrine common to Presbyterians and Episcopalians, and essential to the existence of the Christian ministry.* The point of difference is, whether all ministers are on a *level* and empowered by succession to ordain; or whether there is not a grade of ministers superior to Presbyters, and now called Bishops, who alone receive in *succession* the power of *ordination*, of conveying the ministerial commission. In other words—Is Episcopal or Presbyterian ordination valid? The validity of the former is not compatible with an acknowledgment of the validity of the latter. For it is evident that if a grade of ministers, now called Bishops, and superior to Presbyters, were constituted to convey in *succession* the ministerial commission, to exercise in *succession* the *power of ordination*, this power must remain exclusively with them, until they are deprived of it by the same divine authority whence they derived it. The people may with the same propriety wrest the power of ordination

* In the second number of the Christian's Magazine you come forth, as I expected, a *consistent Presbyterian;* and maintain that the doctrine of *uninterrupted succession* is as essential to Presbyterians as Episcopalians We differ on many points. I am happy to find that on some we agree.

from the Presbyters with whom you contend it is placed, as the Presbyters may from the Bishops, if originally vested in them.

With whomsoever then this power of ordination was deposited, with Presbyters, or with a superior grade of church officers, with them it must remain, until divine authority changes the deposit, and places it in other hands. That the power of ordination was in the first instance vested in the Apostles, is a position which can occasion no difference of opinion between us. With whom did the Apostles vest this power, is the fundamental point, the hinge on which the whole subject turns. Let us appeal to the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, whom the Apostle Paul placed in the churches at Ephesus and Crete. In these churches there were certainly both Elders or Presbyters, and Deacons. In Ephesus there were Elders before St. Paul sent Timothy to that city;* and it is highly improbable that the gospel should have been preached in the extensive island of Crete, and no Elders left there by St. Paul to minister in the churches. Elders and Deacons are frequently named in these Epistles. Now, did these Elders and Deacons possess the power of ordination? We find not the shadow of evidence of their exercising this power, or of its being entrusted to them. On the contrary, Timothy and Titus were sent to the churches for the express purpose of exercising the power of ordination, of "ordaining Elders in every city."† No persons are spoken of as vested with this power but Timothy and Titus; and to them alone are directions given for the exercise of it. Would special messengers be sent to any place to exercise a power already in the hands of numbers adequate to the purpose?‡ If the

* Acts xx. 17. † Titus i. 5.

‡ That there were Elders in Ephesus before St. Paul sent Timothy there will not admit of doubt. It is possible there were not Elders in Crete when Titus was sent there. But then the difficulty is, Why did not St. Paul ordain Elders himself when he was in Crete, and vest them with the power of ordination? His not doing so, and his sending Titus vested with this power, without the most distant hints, that the Elders

second grade of the ministry, called in scripture Elders, or Presbyters, and sometimes Bishops, had possessed the power of ordination, is it not extraordinary that, in the enumeration of their powers and duties in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, this power should not have been enumerated? If Timothy and Titus were not superior to the Elders of Ephesus and Crete, is it not extraordinary that the Apostle should address them in language, and vest them with powers, evidently denoting a superiority; that he should give them such directions concerning the ordaining, governing, and judging of the Elders and Deacons, as would lead obviously to the conclusion that they alone were the depositories of these powers? Is it not extraordinary that he should expressly vest the power of ordination in Timothy and Titus, and never once hint at the association of the Elders with them in the exercise of it, never once allude to this power as one of the functions of Elders or Presbyters?

An attempt has been made to support the claim of Presbyters to ordain, from the address of St. Paul to Timothy, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the *Presbytery*." And has then the right of Presbyters to ordain no other support than the contemptible *sophistry* of *names*?* Who knows that the *Presbytery* referred to by the Apostle was a council of those whom we now call Presbyters? *Presbytery*† literally signifies an *assembly of old men.* In an

possessed it, is conclusive evidence that it was a power peculiar to Titus as a superior officer.

* I am lost in amazement at finding in the second number of the Christian's Magazine, that you adopt and defend this argument from names. This amazement is excited neither by the novelty nor ingenuity of your remarks, but by your temerity in thus hazarding your cause and your own reputation. I shall pay my respects to you on this subject before I conclude these letters; and feel myself perfectly secure in the assertion, that I shall be able to prove that even Dr. M. with all his caution, sometimes permits his "zeal to outstrip his prudence;" and with all his vigilance, sometimes "nods."

† Πρεσβυτεριον, from πρεσβυς, an old man.

ecclesiastical sense it denotes an *assembly of church officers.* It cannot, therefore, denote *exclusively* those whom we now call Presbyters; but may very properly be applied to a council of Apostles and church officers superior to Elders or Presbyters. It is undoubted that the Apostles, who certainly were superior to Presbyters, were sometimes denominated *Presbyters.* Peter called himself an *Elder* or Presbyter (1 Pet. v. 1.) And so does St. John (2 John i. 1. 3 John 1.)* Why then may not the *Apostles*, collectively, be styled a Presbytery? This application of it is maintained by the principal ancient commentators. It is incredible that the *Presbytery* here meant should be a council of the grade of church officers, who are called in these epistles Elders or Presbyters. For then the absurdity results that Timothy was ordained by a council of the very men whom he was sent to ordain and to govern! It is undeniable, however, that whoever the Presbytery were, St. Paul was himself the chief agent, the actual ordainer of Timothy; he alone conveyed the ministerial authority.† For he expressly enjoins Timothy, "Stir up the gift of God which is in thee, BY the putting on of my hands." The Presbytery, whosoever they were, only associated with him as *concurring* in the work.‡

* In the original πρεσβυτερος, Presbyter.

† This is CALVIN's opinion. He maintains that Paul alone ordained Timothy, and quotes the text 2 Tim. i. 6. "Stir up the gift of God which is in thee, by the putting on of my hands." Cal. Inst. lib. iv. cap. iii. 16.

‡ Where the Presbytery is named (1 Tim. iv. 14.,) the preposition of *concurrence*, μετα, is used. Where the imposition of the hands of St. Paul is mentioned (2 Tim. i. 6,) the preposition δια, denoting the *efficient* or *instrumental* cause, is used. This distinctive force of the two prepositions, δια and μετα, was denied by the author of Miscellanies. The *general* and appropriate signification of these prepositions is certainly the following. "Δια, with the genitive, signifies *per*, denoting *a cause of almost any kind*, particularly *the efficient or instrumental cause.*" "Μετα, with the genitive, denotes *with, together with.*" Now, be it remembered, that where the agency of St. Paul, in the ordination of Timothy, is mentioned, the preposition δια is used governing the geni-

When pressed hard with the evident facts that Timothy and Titus were superior officers vested with the powers of ordination and government, the opponents of Episcopacy urge—Timothy and Titus were Evangelists, they were extraordinary officers, and the superior powers vested in them were to cease in their persons! On this supposition then the power of ordination ceases in them, for there is not the shadow of evidence that the Elders or Presbyters of Ephesus and Crete possessed this power. The Independents, who maintained that there is no power of ordination conveyed by succession to any ministers, but that it is vested in the great body of Christians, availed themselves of this very argument against the Presbyterians. When the Presbyterians contended that Presbyters possessed the power of ordination, because Timothy and Titus, whom they considered as no more than Presbyters, exercised this power, the Independents replied, that Timothy and Titus were *Evangelists*, were *extraordinary officers*, and no arguments concerning the powers of Presbyters are to be drawn from their case. Let Presbyterians beware then, lest, in demolishing Episcopacy, they furnish the Independents with weapons to destroy Presbytery. Timothy and Titus were indeed Evangelists. But what inseparable connection was there between their duty as Evangelists to proclaim the gospel, and the power of ordination vested in them, so that when the former ceased, the latter ceased also? Their being Evangelists was an adventitious circumstance, no way necessary to the existence of their *ordinary* powers. Prove that the powers of Timothy and

tive. St. Paul, therefore, was the *efficient* or *instrumental* agent in the ordination. When the agency of the Presbytery is mentioned, the preposition μετα is used governing the genitive. Of course, the *Presbytery*, whether a council of Apostles or of *Presbyters*, properly so called, only concurred *with, together with*, St. Paul. He actually conveyed ministerial authority. They assented, concurred in this act. What now becomes of Mr. M'Leod's assertion? "There is not an instance in the whole Bible, of imposition of hands as a token of assent." Eccl. Cat. p. 142

Titus ceased, because they were Evangelists, and it will be easy to prove that there are no ministers in the Christian church; for Presbyters and Deacons were *Evangelists* as well as Timothy and Titus.

The book of Revelations affords additional proof that in every church there was a superior officer, corresponding to him whom we now call Bishop, who was vested with supreme power in the church.

St. John introduces our Lord addressing seven Epistles to the *seven Angels* of the *seven churches* of Asia. The Epistles could not have been addressed to the collective body of Christians in the churches; for they are designated by the *seven candlesticks*, which are distinguished from the *seven stars*, by which the *Angels* are denoted. The *Angels* were evidently *single* persons. They are uniformly addressed as such. The supposition that by way of *figure*, the whole body of the *ministry* of these churches is addressed under the denomination of an Angel is without foundation.* It is predicated on what cannot be proved, that the *ministers* in those churches were united into one body, called a *Presbytery*. The titles of *Angels* and *stars* in the book of Revelations are never thus figuratively applied to a *collective* body of men, but always denote *single* persons.† And we are confirmed in the natural and obvious opinion that they were single persons by the concurring testimony of ecclesiastical writers, that Bishops were settled in these churches about the period that these Epistles were written. The *Angels* of these churches then were *single* persons And it is beyond doubt that they were vested with superior and supreme power in those churches; for they are commended or reproved for the

* This hypothesis of Mr. M'Leod, advanced originally by some English Dissenters, called the "*Smectymnuan* Divines," is disclaimed by many of the most learned advocates of Presbytery, *Beza*, *Blondel*, and others, who agree with Dr. *Campbell*, that the Angels in the Revelations were *single persons*, vested with supremacy in those churches.

† Rev. ii. 28. xii. 1. xxi. 12, 14.

excellencies or the faults of these churches, for which, as *supreme governors*, they were responsible.

But, we are told, there is no express *precept* in scripture for *Episcopacy*. The distinction and subordination of the grades of the ministry, and the appropriation of the power of ordination to the first grade, are founded only on *Apostolical practice* and *institution;* and these are inferior in obligation to *divine authority*. Express precept alone can be admitted as evidence of *divine institution*.

But this argument operates with equal force against Presbytery and Episcopacy. The advocates of the divine institution of Presbytery can appeal only to *Apostolic practice* or *institution*. Viewing you as a genuine and consistent Presbyterian, I am persuaded you will candidly confess that Presbytery must be maintained by the same *species of evidence* which is urged in support of Episcopacy. All the advocates of the *divine right* of Presbytery argue from *Apostolic practice;* and maintain that on this point, Apostolic practice and institution is evidence of divine right.*

If the *broad* principle be admitted, that express precept only, and not Apostolic practice is conclusive evidence of divine right, by what proof shall we establish the *divine institution* of the *first day Sabbath*, and the *divine authority* of *infant baptism*? The Apostles acted under *divine inspiration*. Those *institutions*, therefore, which they settled, and which are not obviously of a *local* and *temporary* nature, are authorized by that *divine Spirit* under which they acted, and are to be reverenced and obeyed as from *God*. The contrary

* Mr. M'Leod, in his Ecclesiastical Catechism (p. 102) expressly asserts—"That certain external model of government, which was *originally adopted* for the preservation of the evangelical doctrines and institutions, and for the careful transmission of them to after ages, is of *divine authority*." And again (p. 17,) "Whatever is supported by *approved examples*—is of *divine right*." In these principles he follows the Westminster Assembly of Divines, who maintained against the Independents the divine right of Presbytery, from *scripture* examples, from Apostolic practice.

principle cuts up by the roots evangelical doctrine, and shakes to its foundation the Christian church.

But are all *Apostolic practices* equally important and obligatory? Certainly not. How then do we distinguish those Apostolic practices which were intended to last and to be *unchangeable*, from those which were temporary and mutable? We can determine instantly, from the *nature* of those practices, whether they were local and temporary, or of general and permanent observance. The love-feasts, the kiss of charity, the Deaconesses who were to attend on women in baptism, were Apostolic *practices* evidently of inferior moment, proper and necessary only under peculiar circumstances of the church, and laid aside when those circumstances changed. But the *practice* of the Apostles in settling the *Christian ministry* is of the first importance, and of permanent obligation. The Christian ministry lies at the foundation of the Christian church. The Apostles were to institute a ministry which was to continue by *succession* "to the end of the world." We have the same right to change the sacraments, and to pretend that they are temporary and mutable, as we have to change the *constitution* of the Christian ministry as settled by *Apostolic practice*. Here the *institutions* of the Apostles must be gathered from their *practice*, from their authoritative *acts*. The ministry is of divine authority, and rests solely on a *divine commission*.* This commission must be derived from Christ, the source of all power in the church, by a *succession* of persons authorized to transmit it. In no other way can it be derived. Admit that this succession has been interrupted; admit that the *mode* of transmitting the ministerial commission may be changed, may be placed in other hands than those in whom the Apostles placed it, and you render null the promise of Christ, "Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." You suffer the gates of hell to prevail against the

* "No man taketh this honour to himself, but he that is called of God as was Aaron." Heb. v. 4.

church: for you wrest from it its divine character; you make its ministers and its sacraments human officers and human ordinances. Quenched its life-blood, the power of Christ, it becomes a lifeless trunk. You have severed it from its divine Head, from which it derives spiritual growth and nourishment. The connection between the *visible church* and the "LORD of all," can only be kept up by a visible *ministry*, administering visible *sacraments;* and this ministry can derive its authority from Christ only, in that mode and order originally constituted.

We contend not then that *Episcopacy* is unchangeable, merely because it is the original form of government settled by Apostolic practice. The most important ends of government, some persons maintain, may be answered nearly as well by one form as by another; and in this point of view they think there may be force in the observation,

> "For forms of government let fools contest,
> That which is best administered is best."

But EPISCOPACY is UNCHANGEABLE, because it is the originally constituted mode of conveying that *commission*, without which there can be no visible ministry, no visible sacraments, no visible church. The power of ordination must remain with the *first grade of the ministry*, now called Bishops, because with them it was placed by the Apostles divinely commissioned to found the church, to constitute its ministry, and to provide for the continuance of this ministry "to the end of the world." Change the ministry; place the power of ordination in other hands—the church is no longer founded "on the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." Its constitution and ministry have no power but what man gives them. It rests on the sandy foundation of *human authority*. When "the floods come, when the rains descend, when the winds blow and beat upon it," it will fall; for it is not founded on the ROCK OF AGES.

## LETTER XII.

Sir,

The distinction and subordination of the grades of the ministry, and the appropriation of the power of ordination and the supreme government to the first grade, now called Bishops, rest upon *divine authority*, displayed in the *institution* and *practice* of the Apostles.

Apostolic institution and practice, thus satisfactorily proved from the writings of the New Testament, affords Episcopacy a support not to be shaken by your reasonings, however plausible, nor by your assertions, however bold and positive.

It is natural on this subject to inquire, what was the practice of the ages immediately succeeding that part of the Apostolic age, a record of which is given us in the New Testament? If the testimony of those ages prove the *fact* of the universal prevalence of Episcopacy, and assign no human origin to it, the conclusion is irresistible that it must have been instituted by the Apostles. It is incredible that the Apostles should have constituted a parity in the ministry, established Presbyterian government, and yet that the primitive Christians, before the Apostles were scarcely cold in their graves, should have permitted some ambitious prelates to subvert the Apostolic constitution of the ministry, and to exalt themselves as "lords in God's heritage." Such a change must have wanted motive; for the place of Bishops in the primitive ages was peculiarly the place of dangers and death. Such a change would have been opposed by every principle of human nature, by the reverence of the Presbyters and people for Apostolic institutions, by a laudable desire to maintain their own rights, and by that high "spirit of man," which rises up against oppression. Such a change, we may safely assert, would not have been affected without powerful opposition. The records of those ages would have marked it as an extraordinary event in the history of the

church; would have exhibited the agitations and collisions to which it must have given rise. The comparatively trifling controversy concerning the day on which the festival of Easter was to be observed, threw the primitive church into tumult, and occasioned a schism between the Eastern and Western churches. This controversy is a subject of particular record. Is it then credible that the Apostolic constitution of the ministry should have been totally changed soon after the death of the Apostles, and not the most remote hint of such a change to be met with in any ecclesiastical writings for near four hundred years?

If then the primitive Fathers are not only silent concerning this change, but bear explicit testimony to the universal prevalence of Episcopacy, and speak of it as universally received on the ground of Apostolic institution, the prejudice must be invincible which will still maintain that *Presbytery* was the original institution, and Episcopacy an usurpation. We use the Fathers merely as credible witnesses to matters of fact, in regard to which they could not have been deceived. We lay no stress on their *individual* testimony; we care not for their erroneous and contradictory *opinions;* it is only their *concurring testimony* to a *matter of fact*, to the universal prevalence of Episcopacy, on which we lay stress. He who rejects their *testimony* on this subject, strikes at the root of all historical evidence, and sweeps with the besom of darkness the history of past ages.*

I mean not to intrude upon you the series of evidence from the writings of the Fathers, which demonstrates the distinction and subordination of the three grades of the ministry, Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons. This evidence is to be found in almost every book which has been written upon the subject. It has been exhibited, with admirable perspicuity

* It should be remarked that he who impugns the testimony of the apostolic fathers to the divine institution of Episcopacy, does by that act destroy the only evidence for the canonical authority of the books of the New Testament.—Ed.

and force, by the eminent divines POTTER and LESLIE. You will pardon me if I think that whatever may be the pretensions of those who wish to swell themselves into importance, and to extort homage, by haughty airs and bold assertions, POTTER and LESLIE were at least *equal* to Dr MASON in extent and depth of erudition, in critical acumen, in strength of reasoning, and in the knowledge of the *primitive Fathers*.* The weight of the *primitive* evidence in support of Episcopacy has been well tried; its accuracy and bearings have been thoroughly scrutinized. And whatever may be your affectation of originality, were you ten times more "*learned*" than you are, and the humble writer who addresses you as learned as yourself, (*incredibile dictu!*) we should neither of us be able to adduce one argument of any importance on this subject, which has not, in some shape or other, been advanced by others.†

There are, however, palpable and universally acknowledged facts which demonstrate that the Apostolic and primitive church must have been Episcopal. You cannot open an ecclesiastical writer, either of the present or primitive age, who does not stare you in the face with the facts that there were *Bishops*, *Presbyters*, and *Deacons* in the primitive church. Yes, sir, such Bishops as we have in modern days, with Presbyters subject to them. That IGNATIUS was Bishop of Antioch, that CYPRIAN was Bishop of Carthage, are facts just as well established as that these holy martyrs lived—

* Archbishop POTTER was the author of the learned work on the "Antiquities of Greece;" and LESLIE of that admirable tract entitled, "A Short and easy Method with the Deists." The tract of the latter in support of Episcopacy is republished in "the Scholar Armed;" and the work of the former is entitled, "A Discourse on Church Government." I mention this for the sake of "unlearned" readers. To attempt to give any information on these points to Dr. Mason, I am aware would be the highest presumption.

† No person will be at a loss to justify this language, who considers the sneering contempt with which the Christian's Magazine treats all who are so unfortunate as to incur its displeasure.

established by the testimony of the very same writers who are adduced to prove that the books of the Old and New Testament were received as inspired books. The most superficial reader of ecclesiastical history is familiar with the names of IGNATIUS, *Bishop* of Antioch, and CYPRIAN, *Bishop* of Carthage. The church in those cities he naturally concludes must have consisted of several congregations, in which there must have been *Presbyters* to officiate. And as Ignatius and Cyprian are styled by way of *eminence* and *exclusion*, Bishop of Antioch, Bishop of Carthage, he of course concludes that there were no other Bishops in those cities, but that Ignatius and Cyprian superintended the church in them, consisting of Presbyters and their congregations; in other words, that they were *diocesan Bishops*. These are the conclusions which every reader of ecclesiastical history, who is not biassed to some preconceived system, would naturally and immediately form.

It seems, however, that the sense of ecclesiastical history has been wholly misrepresented. The language of all ecclesiastical historians has been inaccurate. You threaten us that you will be able to prove that the testimony of the primitive Fathers has been misstated, that they give no support to Episcopacy! This *bold* language gives me no surprise. Nor should I be at all surprised, were you to go a little further, and assert that no one understands the primitive Fathers but yourself! Very modest indeed! Who can avoid being charmed with this unparalleled humility? The most learned men that ever adorned the Christian church, the HOOKERS, the BULLS, the PEARSONS, the BEVERIDGES, the WAKES, the POTTERS, the CHILLINGWORTHS, the LESLIES, and "a legion more," knew nothing of the primitive Fathers! The glory which has hitherto surrounded these luminaries of the church, is to fade away before the resistless lustre of those beams which the superior learning of the Editor of the Christian's Magazine is to shed on the darkness of the primitive age!

Over these feeble men, the HOOKERS, the BULLS, the PEARSONS, and their "compeers," perhaps you may triumph! But will you raise the arm of rebellion against your great master, CALVIN? Will you assert that he knew nothing of the primitive Fathers, that he has misunderstood or perverted their meaning? I have nothing to do here with CALVIN'S form of church government, or with the arguments by which he attempts to support it from scripture. I merely adduce his judgment as to a *matter of fact*, to the constitution of the primitive church *as exhibited* by the Fathers. Now, CALVIN, in the fourth book of his institutions, expressly admits that the *primitive* church was Episcopal, that there were *three grades* of the ministry, and that the *first grade* possessed *superior powers*.

We find CALVIN asserting the superiority of Bishops to Priests. "Therefore, to whom the office of teaching was enjoined, all these they named Priests. In every city they chose out of their own number *one man*, to whom they specially gave the title of *Bishop;* that dissentions should not grow of equality, as it is wont to come to pass. Yet the Bishop was not so *above the rest* in honour and dignity, that he had a dominion above his fellows."* I have nothing to do with CALVIN'S *opinion*, that this superiority or precedence of a Bishop over Priests, was "by men's consent brought in for the necessity of the times;" or with his authority for this opinion. My object at present is, only to prove that he admits the fact that there was such a superiority in the primitive church. He distinguishes Bishops and Priests as two *distinct grades* of the ministry. "But so much as belongeth to the office whereof we now speak, as well the *Bishops* as the *Priests*, were bound to apply the distributing of the word and sacraments."† He notices this distinction again when he endeavours to prove that in the primitive church (as in the Episcopal Church in America) the clergy

* Calvin's Institutes, lib. iv. cap. iv. 1.

† Calvin's Institutes, lib. iv. cap. iv. 3.

and people chose their Bishop. "Let *him* be chosen (Bishop) whom the *clergy* and the people, or the greater number shall require."* Here he makes an evident distinction between the *Bishop* and the *clergy*. The person thus chosen *Bishop* by the *clergy* and the people, CALVIN asserts, was, in the primitive church, to be raised to this superior grade *by ordination*. "There remaineth of the Nicene Council, that the metropolitan (the chief Bishop of the province) should meet together with all the *Bishops* of the province, to *order* him who is chosen."† According to CALVIN the Bishops in the privitive church were *governors* of the clergy. "For this end to *every Bishop* was committed the *government of his own clergy*, that they should rule their clerks (their clergy) according to the canons, and hold them to their duty."‡ Nay, that according to the judgment of CALVIN there were in the primitive church the three *grades* of ministers, *Bishops*, *Priests*, and *Deacons*, and that the *Bishop* exercised the chief power in ordaining, is indisputable from the following passage: "In the solemn assembly the BISHOPS had a certain apparel whereby they might be distinctly known from other PRIESTS. They ordered all Priests and Deacons with only laying on of hands. But *every Bishop*, with the company of Priests, *ordained his own* PRIEST. But although they did all the same thing; yet because the Bishop went before, and it was all done as it were by his guiding, therefore the ordering was called his. Whereupon the *old writers* have oft this saying;—that a *Priest* differeth from a Bishop in no other thing, but because *he hath not the power of ordering*."§ CALVIN's testimony in this passage to *a matter of fact*, that in the primitive church, "every Bishop, with his company of Priests, ordained his own Priest;" and that, according to the "old writers," "a Priest —hath not the power of ordering," is to be carefully distinguished from his *opinion* that "the ordering was called" the

* Calvin's Institutes, lib. iv. cap. iv. 11. † Cap. iv. 14. ‡ Cap. xii. 22.
§ Calvin's Institutes, lib. iv. cap. iv. 15.

Bishop's merely because he "went before." This reason is a gloss of CALVIN's, for which he brings no authority. Let me appeal to the candid whether the above description of a *primitive ordination* does not answer exactly to the *ordinations* in the Episcopal churches of the present day; and whether it bears the same resemblance to Presbyterian ordinations.

But perhaps CALVIN has been describing the constitution of the church after it had become corrupted by the leaven of *Popery*. No, sir, the above passages are selected from a chapter of his Institutes, the title of which is, "Of the State of the *Old Church*, and of the Manner of governing that was in use *before the Papacy*." Nay, in introducing this account of the *primitive* government, he observes, "It shall be profitable in those things to consider the *form of the old church*, which shall represent to our minds a *certain image of God's institution*." And again, "The Bishops of those times—with such heedfulness *framed all their order* after the *only rule of God's holy word*, that a man may easily see that in this point they had in a manner *nothing disagreeing from the word of God*.* To reconcile CALVIN's form of church government with the "form of the old church," as represented in the above extracts, may be a difficult task. My business is with his *testimony* as above stated, and not with his theories or reasonings.

Now, Sir, if you will undertake to prove that the primitive Fathers knew nothing of "the distinction of superior and inferior clergy;"† if you will undertake to prove that this "distinction, under whatever form or pretext adopted, is unscriptural and anti-Christian;"‡ if you will undertake to prove that in the *primitive* ages "the visible unity of the church was preserved by "*perfect equality* of rank among ministers,"§ I only say you will have serious difficulties to encounter—*Hic labor, hoc opus est*—Certainly not among the

* Calvin's Institutes, lib. iv. cap. iv. 1.

† Constitution of the Associate Reformed Church. ‡ Ibid.

§ Christian's Magazine. Introduction.

least of these difficulties will be the authoritative judgment of the "great CALVIN." I submit to the serious consideration of those who embrace the Calvinistic opinions, whether the judgment of CALVIN, the great master of theology, or that of Dr. M. be most worthy of credit. I confess the dilemma in which they are placed is not a pleasant one. If they assert that the primive church was not Episcopal; if they refuse to submit to a primitive "hierarchy," they oppose the judgment of CALVIN, they encounter his awful "anathema." And if they attempt to avoid this anathema, they will be met by the dread denunciations of the *Editor* of the *Christian's Magazine!* Scylla and Charybdis—"Alas! alas!"

But the triumph of Episcopalians is to be blasted by the bold assertion, that the *primitive constitution* of the church, as thus delineated by CALVIN, was an innovation on the Apostolic form, an innovation which took place soon after the Apostolic age.* Now, to say nothing of the improbability of this fundamental change in the constitution of the Christian church; to say nothing of the impracticability of a few ambitious "prelates," thus sweeping away the institutions of the Apostles, and exalting themselves into the thrones of corrupt power on the ruins of Apostolic authority; to say nothing of the insuperable difficulties which they must have had to encounter in the reverence of the primitive Christians for Apostolic institutions, in the ardour with which the clergy and people would have maintained their rights and resisted unhallowed usurpation; to say nothing of the humble, holy, and celestial virtues of the primitive Bishops, the martyrs to the faith of Jesus, which forbid the imputing to them motives and objects so dishonourable and criminal, we may at least inquire, *Where* is the *record* of this fundamental change? Where the irrefragable proof of this unparalleled usurpation, which, stripping Presbyters of those powers which but a few years before they had received from the hands of the Apos-

* The most learned opponents of Episcopacy, BLONDEL, SALMASIUS, CHAMIER, and others, fix it at this period.

tles as a sacred deposit, made them bow their necks under the feet of usurping "lords in God's heritage?" We are at once boldly answered, the record is at hand! In fearful anxiety we wait for it. It flashes upon us in "the famous testimony of JEROME."*

And who was JEROME? Was he one of the early Fathers? Did he live during that period at which the usurpations of Episcopacy were effected? No, near three hundred years after. The alleged usurpation of Episcopacy took place, according to BLONDEL, about forty years after the death of the Apostles; and JEROME flourished near the close of the fourth century.† IGNATIUS, POLYCARP, JUSTIN MARTYR, TERTULLIAN, who lived in the second century, say nothing of this wonderful revolution. ORIGEN and CYPRIAN, who lived in the third century, had not found out that the superiority of *Bishops* over *Presbyters*, to which, with the preceding Fathers, they bear such ample testimony, was an usurpation, an innovation on Apostolic order. The learned historian EUSEBIUS, who, in the beginning of the fourth century, drew up his ecclesiastical history from all the writings of the preceding ages that could be procured, while he records many minute events and schisms in the church, is not only utterly silent as to this extraordinary usurpation of Episcopacy, but, on the contrary, gives a list of the Bishops in the principal cities up to the Apostles themselves!

Few as may be the ecclesiastical writings of the early ages now extant, in some of them surely we should expect to find a record of this alleged innovation. They narrate minute events. Would they have passed over one that must have entirely changed the features of the visible church? And on whom is reliance placed for proof, that in the beginning of the second century Bishops usurped authority over Presbyters? On JEROME, who lived at the close of the fourth century! "Alas! alas!" Desperate is thy cause

* Christian's Magazine, No. II. p. 215

† He died A. D. 420.

Presbytery! The struggles of death must have siezed thee when thy advocates are thus compelled to outrage the common sense of mankind. What! we are to believe that a change in ecclesiastical government—an usurpation of ecclesiastical authority, the most extraordinary and fundamental that ever the world witnessed—a change and usurpation, in regard to which contemporary and succeeding writers are totally silent—we are to believe that they took place on the authority of a writer who lived near three hundred years after the period when they must have been effected! What should we think of a man who should start up and maintain, on the authority of Dr. M. that near three hundred years ago, when the government of the whole Christian church was *Presbyterian*, it was transformed into Episcopacy, into an usurping hierarchy; while not a single ecclesiastical writer, from that time to the present, lisps a syllable concerning this most extraordinary revolution! Really, really, I am apprehensive we should think such a person had thrown aside that common sense which is the surest guide of man, and should, with BEZA, exclaim, in the emotions of amazement and indignation, "God forbid that any man in his senses should assent to the *madness* of such a man!"

Utterly inadmissible, therefore, is the testimony of JEROME to an event which took place centuries before his time, and on which all preceding writers are not merely silent, but bear opposite testimony. But let us scrutinize this "famous testimony," to which the Editor of the Christian's Magazine triumphantly clings as the anchor of his cause. Let us examine the *character* of the witness, and the *nature* of his testimony.

Is the witness unbiassed and unprejudiced! No! Suspicions on this point attach to him, which powerfully tend to weaken the force of his opinion. It is very well known, that, distinguished as were the talents and learning of JEROME, his imagination was lively, and his disposition warm

and impetuous.* He had been incensed against John, Bishop of Jerusalem, and some other Bishops, for what he considered undue claims of prerogative, and wrote some severe strictures upon them. He was also offended with the *Deacons* for their attempt to place themselves on a level with Presbyters. Under these impressions he endeavours, in different parts of his writings, to exalt *his own office* of PRESBYTER as much as possible, in order to check particularly the aspiring pretensions of the *Deacons*. We impeach not the veracity of JEROME. We might receive his testimony in regard to any important event which took place in his own day. But when he attempts to state the occurrences of a period prior to his own, and particularly when he founds his statements upon *reasoning*, and not upon positive testimony, it becomes a matter of *opinion*. It is then our duty not merely to test the soundness of his *reasoning*, but to inquire whether there were not circumstances which might give a false bias to his judgment.

Are we then to receive implicitly the *opinion* of a warm and impetuous man as proof of an event which must have

* The learned and impartial ecclesiastical historian, DUPIN, thus characterises JEROME. "His genius was *hot* and *vehement;* he fell upon his adversaries with fierceness, made them ridiculous by his jests, trampled on them with terms of contempt, and made them blush with reproaches. Though he was very learned, yet there is infinitely more liveliness and vehemency in his exhortations and polemical works than *exactness* and solidity. He knew a great deal; but he never argued upon principles, which made him sometimes *contradict himself*. He often carries *his subject too far*, being transported with his ordinary heat." "As he indulges his ordinary heat too much, so he falleth into those *extremes* for which he hath been often blamed." Dupin's Ecclesiastical History, book iii. p. 103, 104. But lest the testimony of Dupin should be impeached because he was an advocate of the hierarchy, let us hear what MOSHEIM says of ST. JEROME. "His complexion was excessively *warm* and *choleric;* his *bitterness* against those who differed from him extremely keen, and his thirst of glory insatiable. He was so prone to censure, that several persons, whose lives were not only irreproachable, but even exemplary, became the objects of his unjust accusations."—Mosheim. Eccl. Hist. Cent. iv. Part. ii. chap. 2.

taken place a considerable time before he was born, and in regard to which all preceding writers are silent? Are we to rest implicitly on the opinion of a man advanced under the influence of feelings of disgust and irritation, which must have tended to pervert his judgment; advanced with the evident aim of depreciating *Bishops* and *Deacons* who had offended him? Is a man considered as an impartial judge in cases in which his feelings, his rights, or his reputation are *peculiarly* interested? Yet in this very predicament was JEROME. At various times he was engaged in controversy with some Bishops and Deacons concerning the encroachments which he conceived they were disposed to make on his office of Presbyter. Personal and interested feelings must have thus been powerfully called forth. Under the influence of these feelings, JEROME advances an *opinion* concerning a supposed revolution in the church more than two centuries before his time. He gives not a most distant hint of its being a recent occurrence; but fixes it, according to the opinion of his most learned advocates, near the apostolic age!

And this is "the famous testimony of JEROME," a testimony "which cannot be shaken, we are told, by any art that sophistry possesses!" Suppose for a moment, that EUSEBIUS, the ecclesiastical historian at the commencement of the fourth century, and the writers who preceded him, had borne the same testimony to Presbytery which they do to Episcopacy! Suppose that EUSEBIUS, instead of tracing as he does the succession of Bishops in the principal cities, up to the Apostles themselves, had recorded that in all those cities from the time of the Apostles, *Presbyteries* had been organized; and that neither he, nor any writer who preceded him, had given the most distant hint of this Presbyterian government having been an innovation. What should we think of an Episcopalian who should attempt to prove this fact by the opinion of a subsequent Father of the Church, formed under circumstances that tended to give a false bias

to his judgment? Episcopacy! I should blush, I should tremble for thee, wast thou reduced to this miserable expedient.

We reject then the *testimony* of JEROME. We reject him as a *witness* on this subject. We reject him as a *reasoner*. He lived too long after the event to which he testifies is supposed to have occurred to be a *credible witness*. And there were too many personal considerations that called forth his natural irritability, and influenced his judgment, to permit his being, on this point, an *impartial reasoner*. But still we will meet his testimony on the ground of its naked merits. We will place it in the face of day. Wonderful! if the very testimony adduced to prove Episcopacy an usurpation, should favour its apostolic institution!

Behold then the testimony of a Father who lived at the close of the fourth century, and which is relied on to prove that "the supremacy of Bishops was a *human invention*." JEROME adduces instances from scripture, in which *Bishop* and *Presbyter* denote the same office, and then *reasons* from the identity of names, that there was originally a parity in the ministry, but "that afterwards it was enacted as a *remedy for schism*, that there should be one elected who should be placed over the rest, lest every man pulling to himself should rend asunder the Church of Christ. For at Alexandria, from Mark the Evangelist even unto the Bishops Heraclas and Dionysius, the Presbyters always named Bishop one chosen from themselves, placed in a higher grade."* JEROME more particularly states his opinion in his commentary on Titus. Arguing still from the identity of names, he concludes, that a Presbyter and Bishop were originally the same, "and before, through the instigation of the devil, contensions arose in religion, and it was said among the people, *I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas*, churches were governed by a common council of Presbyters. But afterwards, when every one accounted those whom he had baptized as his own

* Hieronym. Epist. 85. ad Evag.

disciples, and not Christ's, it was decreed in the whole world, that one chosen from among the Presbyters should be placed over the rest, to whom the care of the church should appertain, that hereby the seeds of schism might be taken away As therefore Presbyters do know, that from the custom of the church they are subject to him who is set over them; so the Bishops should know that they are greater more by custom than by the truth of any ordinance of our Lord."

Now, admitting that these passages prove that, in the opinion of JEROME, Episcopacy was a "human invention," it would be sufficient, in order to destroy this testimony, to produce many other passages from his writings, in which he explicitly maintains that the supremacy of Bishops was an *institution of the Apostles*. A witness who contradicts himself destroys his credibility.

It is also of importance to observe, that this opinion of JEROME is not founded on any *record of the fact*, but on *reasoning* from the identity of names. And as this reasoning can be proved to be fallacious, his *opinion* (improperly styled *testimony*) falls to the ground.

I maintain, however, that "this famous testimony of JEROME" will fairly bear a construction in favour of the *apostolic institution* of Episcopacy; and such a construction only can render this testimony of JEROME consistent with his other declarations, and with common sense.

1. It is of importance to observe, that the opinion of JEROME is not explicit to the point in proof of which it is alleged. He does not positively deny that the superiority of Bishops over Presbyters was an *apostolic* institution. He does not positively assert that the change from Presbytery did *not* take place in the *times of the Apostles*, and that it was a *human invention*. To make these assertions he had every possible inducement. Warmly tenacious of his prerogatives as Presbyter, and irritated at what he conceived the encroachments of the other orders of the ministry, he sought on all occasions to exalt, as much as possible, the

office of Presbyters, and to depress the orders of Bishops and Deacons. This favourite object, to which the strongest personal considerations conspiring with the warmth and impetuosity of his temper urged him, would have been effectually accomplished by the express assertion that this alteration was made after the *death of the Apostles*. Under *such* circumstances we would naturally expect, not *ambiguous*, but *positive*, unequivocal language. But instead of the explicit assertion that Episcopacy was a "human invention," he only maintains, that originally there was a parity in the ministry, and that (for very substantial reasons) a change took place, and a Bishop was exalted over Presbyters; and this change, for any thing JEROME says to the contrary, may have been made by some of the Apostles themselves. It is true, he says, Bishops are superior to Presbyters principally by "the *custom* of the church." But still this *custom* may have been founded on the *practice of the Apostles*, who changed the original parity of the ministry when they found it injurious to the church. Let it be observed, that he does not deny that *apostolic practice* was the foundation of this custom, but is "contented only to deny that our *Lord himself made the distinction*." It may be said, indeed, that apostolic practice in settling the ministry is equivalent to divine institution; and why, therefore, should JEROME oppose them to each other? Because his object appears to be, to prove merely that by the *original* constitution of the ministry by our Lord and his Apostles, Bishops and Presbyters were equal, and that the supremacy of Bishops was a change soon found necessary for the welfare of the church.

Listen, sir, on this point, to the reasoning of one who certainly was not unduly partial to the Episcopal cause.* "JEROME's design evidently was to say all that he thought true against the distinction between Bishops and Presbyters.

* Bishop Hoadley, in his Defence of Episcopal Ordination, chap. i. p. 86, 87.

And yet in all his zeal against this distinction, he saith only that there was a time when this distinction was not in being; but never intimates *that it was not made and settled* in the days of the *Apostles* themselves; or that *Presbyters* of after ages *altered* the design of the *Apostles* after their deaths: which single thing, if he could have said with any truth, must have done his cause more service than all he hath alleged; and therefore I conclude, *he would certainly have said it, and endeavoured to prove it, if he had thought it true.*" "If his design had been to prove that this alteration was made some time after the death of the Apostles, his business must have been to show, not only that there was a time during the *lives of the Apostles*, but also that there was an *intermediate space* between Bishops and Presbyters; and this from *passages* of some *writers* or *records* of some churches, *in that intermediate space.* But this *he doth not so much as attempt to do.* And from hence I conclude, that it was *not* his design to *affirm or to intimate any such thing.*"

So far, therefore, from there being any thing in the language of JEROME which forbids the conclusion that this change took place before the death of the Apostles, his expressions rather sanction it. For,

2. The natural construction of the words of JEROME would lead us to conclude, that this change from Presbytery to Episcopacy took place during the *times of the Apostles.*

His argument is, that by the original constitution of the ministry, there was no superiority of Bishops, but "the churches were governed by a common council of Presbyters." But when "the seeds of schism were sown by the people, saying, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos," &c. a Bishop was chosen and placed over Presbyters. Now, we know that this language of schism was used during the *Apostles' times*, and the declarations of JEROME lead us therefore to conclude, that during the *same* period the remedy was applied by exalting Bishops over Presbyters.

Nor is it a conclusive objection to this construction, that several of the apostolic Epistles on which JEROME founds his *reasoning* in favour of ministerial parity, were written *after* the Epistle to the Corinthians, in which Christians are represented as using this language of schism—"I am of Paul, and I of Apollos," &c. This was the commencement of those schisms, which, according to JEROME, were eventually the cause of the change in the Christian ministry.. It is reasonable to conclude they continued till after those apostolic *epistles* were written on which he founds ministerial parity; and, therefore, the introduction of Episcopacy may have been by apostolic authority, since some of the Apostles lived after the epistles were written to which JEROME appeals. "It is not necessary to suppose that ST. JEROME thought, that *immediately upon this disorder in the church of Corinth* this alteration was made; but rather," that it was made "when it appeared that this humour was *not so checked by St. Paul's exhortations*, but that it crept into other churches likewise. What I would say, therefore, is this—That we are assured that these remarks agree to the *age of the Apostles*, and that it is extremely probable that they would not leave it to succeeding Presbyters to provide remedies for the evils which they knew to be in their own times; that we have no such marks belonging *peculiarly* to the *age after them*, and therefore have reason to think that the alteration (if at all) was made *before the death of the Apostles*."* Those schisms, as a remedy for which Jerome supposes Episcopacy was introduced, prevailed in the time of the Apostles. It is absurd to suppose that these inspired rulers of the church would leave it thus rent by schism without prescribing a remedy.

There is nothing in the language of JEROME which forbids the supposition that this alleged revolution took place in the time of the Apostles. On the contrary, he speaks of this change from Presbytery to Episcopacy as the consequence of

* Bishop Hoadley. Defence of Episcopal Ordination, chap i. p. 93.

*a decree made throughout the whole world—Toto orbe decretum est—It was decreed in the whole world.* These words evidently convey the idea that the reception of Episcopacy was *universal*, *immediate*, and without *opposition;* that it was made by those who had authority over the Christian church in the *whole world.* To effect such an extraordinary revolution in the early ages, before any general council had met to regulate the government of the church, apostolic authority alone could be adequate.

Bishop STILLINGFLEET indeed, in his Irenicum (the armory whence many of the opponents of Episcopacy draw their weapons,) observes, "That the emphasis lies not in *decretum est*," not in the *decree*, "but in *toto orbe;* noting how suddenly this order met with *universal acceptance* when it was first brought up in the church after the Apostles' death." But this is mere hypothesis, contrary to the obvious meaning of JEROME's language. Besides, this hypothesis of Bishop STILLINGFLEET is predicated on what JEROME no where asserts, that the supremacy of Bishops took place "after the Apostles' death." This is the very point to be proved. And the very circumstance that JEROME does not expressly make this assertion, when it would have been so much to his purpose, warrants the presumption that he did not believe it. Bishop STILLINGFLEET himself, in a performance published several years after his *Irenicum*, with the evident design of retracting his reasoning in that work, acknowledges—"It is hard to conceive how such an alteration should happen without the *Apostles' act:* for if they had left the Presbyters in full power of government, it is not to be imagined they would so universally part with it, without being obliged thereto by those who had authority over them."* And this remark is founded on the strong trait in human nature, that they who have power are not willing to part with it. How is it possible too, that this fundamental alteration in the constitution of the Christian church, divinely established, should have obtained "*sudden*

* Bishop Stillingfleet's Sermon at St. Paul's.

*universal* acceptance," if it rested only on human authority, if it were not enforced by a decree of the Apostles? The very words indeed of JEROME, are those of an *authoritative decree. Toto orbe decretum*,—it was decreed over all the world. As Bishop Hoadley observes, "These are not words of *voluntary compact* and consent among *Presbyters;* but agreeable to an *authority superior to those Presbyters* who were to be restrained, and whose abuses were to be reformed by this decree: and there being, according to the present hypothesis, no authority before this decree superior to Presbyters, unless that of the Apostles, or some particular extraordinary church officers appointed by the Apostles, this decree for the establishment of Episcopacy must be understood by ST. JEROME to have been in the age of the Apostles themselves."*

The introduction of Episcopacy by the Apostles is supposed to be inconsistent with JEROME's language, that "by little and little (*paulatim*) the whole care was devolved upon one (that the seeds of dissention might be plucked up.") Here, as Bishop STILLINGFLEET supposes in his "Irenicum," JEROME "notes the *gradual* obtaining of" Episcopacy. But how does this supposition accord with JEROME's language, that "it was decreed in the whole world;" which, according even to Bishop STILLINGFLEET's interpretation, "notes how *suddenly* this order met with *universal* acceptance?" The expression of JEROME, "paulatim," *by little and little*, must refer therefore to the progress of the conviction that parity in the ministry would produce schism; which conviction ultimately led to "devolving all care upon one." And all this might have taken place before the death of the Apostles. Nor does his assertion that "one chosen out of (or by) the *Presbyters* should be placed over the rest," prove that the Apostles could not have made this change. For this expression refers to the *mode* in which the Bishop is elected, and not to the "decree" by which this order was introduced.

* Bishop Hoadley's Defence of Episcopal Ordination, chap. i. p. 91.

There is no contradiction in the assertions, that the Apostles decreed that Bishops should be exalted over Presbyters, and yet that the Presbyters elected one of their number to be their Bishop.

But it has been said again,* "Is it imaginable that a man who had been proving all along the superiority of a Presbyter above a Deacon, because of his *identity with a Bishop* in the *Apostles' times*, should, at the same time, say that a Bishop was above a Presbyter by the Apostles' institution, and so directly *overthrow* all that he had been saying before?" Yes—it is not only imaginable, but consistent with JEROME's design. All that he asserts, all that he aims to prove is, that *originally* Bishops and Presbyters were the same, and so constituted by the Apostles. But he no where maintains that the change which advanced a Bishop above a Presbyter was not made before the death of the Apostles. The reason he alleges for this change is, that schisms arose, in consequence of parity in the ministry; and Christians enlisted themselves under the banners of different ministers. Schisms of this kind we know arose during the times of the Apostles. And there is no absurdity, there is no incongruity with JEROME's arguments or design, in supposing that as it gradually became evident that this parity in the ministry would produce schisms, it was decreed by apostolic authority that the order of Bishops should be placed over Presbyters. There was time enough for this change to be produced by apostolic authority. For the Apostle John lived several years after the Epistles were written on which JEROME founds his arguments for parity.†

I am aware it will be triumphantly urged, Where is the *record* from scripture that this supremacy of Bishops which JEROME alleges was a change in the original consti-

* Stillingfleet's Irenicum.

† St. John died A. D. 101. His Epistles are supposed to have been written about the year 90. Afterwards, A. D. 96, he wrote his Revelations, in which, under the denomination of the Angels of the churches, he distinguishes the seven Bishops of the seven churches of Asia.

tution of the church, was effected before the death of the Apostles? And, it may be asked, What *record* does JEROME produce from scripture or from antiquity that the supremacy of the *first grade* of the ministry was a change in the original constitution of the church? Where is his *record*, that this supremacy was an innovation, and not the original apostolic institution? We look for his record—and lo! it turns out to be an *argument* from identity of names—from the names Bishop and Presbyter being in scripture applied to the same grade of ministers!* This is a mere fallacy. The real and important question is not whether the names Bishop and Presbyter do not designate in scripture the *same grade* of ministers; but whether there was not a grade superior to those called Presbyters and Bishops, in which grade were Timothy and Titus, to whom those afterwards called Bishops succeeded. Let it be remembered then, that as this alleged change is entirely a matter of opinion and reasoning, and as JEROME does not assert that it took place after the death of the Apostles, we are not bound to assign it to this period; particularly, when by so doing we shall make JEROME contradict his own express declarations, in other parts of his writings, that Episcopacy was an apostolic institution.

There may be some difficulty in making JEROME consistent with himself. But any inconsistency in which he involves himself destroys the weight of his judgment. We certainly cannot prove from the passages of his writings which have been above considered, that he *positively asserts* the *apostolic institution* of Episcopacy. On the contrary, there may be some parts of his statement which look a contrary way. All for which I would contend is, that he does not positively deny that his alleged change from Presbytery to Episcopacy did not take place before the death of some of the Apostles, and that his language will bear the construction that it was effected under apostolic authority. And I would contend for

* See p. 179.

this construction, because it alone will make JEROME consistent in his statements.

3. For he makes many other declarations which import that he believed Episcopacy was an apostolic institution.

Some of these declarations occur in the passages which constitute what is called his testimony against Episcopacy. When he adduces the Church of Alexandria, he observes, "From *Mark the Evangelist*, to Heraclas and Dionysius, Bishops thereof, the Presbyters always named one chosen out of them, and placed in a higher degree, Bishop." Here we may infer that JEROME maintains the apostolic institution of Episcopacy. He asserts that it commenced in the Church at Alexandria "from Mark the Evangelist." Of course it commenced in the apostolic age. It cannot be said that this *change* was the act of the Presbyters merely. Their business indeed was to choose their Bishop. But as this *change in the ministry*, by which a Bishop was exalted above the Presbyters, commenced from "Mark the Evangelist," it must have had the sanction of apostolic authority. Nor does it follow from the Presbyters choosing their Bishop, that he received his authority from the Presbyters, and was not invested with it by *Episcopal* ordination. The *choice* of a Bishop, the persons by whom he is appointed, and his ordination and the persons by whom it is performed, may be, and commonly are, in all Episcopal churches, distinct. JEROME notes particularly the custom at Alexandria of the Presbyters choosing their Bishop, because in his time the choice was generally made by the Emperor, or by the Bishops of the province, by whom they were afterwards ordained.* JEROME no where states any difference in respect to their ordination between the Bishops of his day, and those of Alexandria. We are at liberty to conclude that these last, though

* It is astonishing that STILLINGFLEET and Dr. CAMPBELL after him, should quote Eutychius, a patriarch of Alexandria in the *tenth century*, to prove that the Presbyters of Alexandria themselves ordained the person whom they had chosen Bishop!

chosen by the Presbyters in like manner "as if an army should choose their general, or Deacons an Archdeacon," were afterwards ordained. "These *Bishops* must, according to St. Jerome, have been the *governors* of the *church*, and of the *Presbyters* themselves: for he makes all the *care* and *solicitude* concerning *ecclesiastical affairs* to be devolved upon them as soon as they were constituted. They must be the *ordainers* of other *Presbyters*, even according to Blondel himself, unless he deny to them what he grants to his *Prime-Presbyters* in each church. So that here are *Bishops* with distinct powers, after their *election*, from those of their *electors* (as distinct as the powers of a *general* from those of the *army* which chooses him, which is one of the *similitudes* by which he illustrates this matter) immediately succeeding *St. Mark* in the *church* of *Alexandria:* and consequently the like in other *churches*, according to St. Jerome, who makes all *churches* uniform, and the reception of *Episcopacy*, whenever it was received, to be universal at the same time."*

After the instance of the church at Alexandria, Jerome uses this strong expression—"*Quid enim facit, excepta ordinatione, Episcopus, quod Presbyter non faciat*"—"For what *does* a Bishop, *except ordination*, which a *Presbyter may not do*?" Here is an acknowledgment that Presbyters had no *original* right to ordain. He could not have meant merely to assert that *in his time* Presbyters did not ordain. He could not have meant—"What does a Bishop which a Presbyter may not do," by *ecclesiastical regultaion*, "except ordination?" For in his day, by ecclesiastical law, Bishops had other powers, (as, for instance, the power of judging and governing the clergy,) to which the Presbyters did not pretend. On this construction the question would lose all its force. His aim is to level, as much as possible, *Bishops* with *Presbyters;* and yet he never vests Presbyters with the *power of ordination*. He ascribes to them originally the *power of government* only. "The churches *were governed*

* Bishop Hoadley. Defence of Episcopal Ordination.

by common councils of Presbyters." The Apostles at this time exercised the power of *ordination*. His aim in levelling Bishops with Presbyters would have been more effectually answered by excluding them expressly from the power of *ordination* as well as *government*. On the contrary, as a writer* (who hath never incurred the imputation of carrying very high the Episcopal claims) well observes, "he doth at the same time himself deny to them this *right* of *ordination*. *This right*, I say; for of that his words must be understood, when he asks, in order to carry their cause as high as he could, *Quid enim, excepta ordinatione, facit Episcopus, quod Presbyter non faciat?* A *Bishop* in his days had many other powers to which *Presbyters* did not pretend, besides that of *ordination;* and therefore the *question* was not at all to his purpose, unless he meant to signify by it, as his opinion, that the *Presbyters* were never entrusted with the affair of *ordination*, though they were with that of the *government* of the *churches* of *Christ* by their joint counsels; by which means he leaves an uninterrupted *succession* to *church officers* superior in *this* to *Presbyters*, and so destroys the supposition of BLONDEL and others, of their continuing in the *exercise* of this *right* near the middle of the *second century*" "And that this was his meaning is plain likewise from ST. CHRYSOSTOM, who follows him in his opinion of the *original rights of Presbyters*, and owns expressly, that *Bishops* are superior to *them* in point of *ordination*, though in that *only:* and this, when he is examining their *original rights*, and not the state they were in in *his* days, in which he knew that *Bishops* were, in other respects, *superior* to *Presbyters*."

In that very epistle to *Evagrius* in which JEROME is supposed to deny the apostolic institution of Bishops, we have the following passage: "And that we may know that the *apostolic traditions* are taken out of the Old Testament, what Aaron and his sons and the Levites were in the tem-

* Bishop Hoadley. Defence of Episcopal Ordination, chap. 1.

ple, let Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons claim for themselves in the church." In this passage the superiority of Bishops to Presbyters is called an *Apostolic tradition;* the obvious meaning of which is, that this *superiority* was sanctioned by the *Apostles.* Against this construction it is alleged that JEROME elsewhere speaks of this superiority as an "*ecclesiastical custom.*" But this objection has no force unless it can be proved, that an ecclesiastical custom cannot be also an apostolical tradition, that an ecclesiastical custom cannot be founded on apostolical tradition or authority. But it is said there is decisive proof that JEROME by "apostolical tradition" meant no more than ecclesiastical usage, from a passage in one of his epistles. "Let every province abound in its own sense, and account of the ordinances of their ancestors as of apostolical laws."* But this is only an injunction to revere some customs confessedly of human institution, *as if* they were apostolical traditions, and does not prove that there were not other customs which were apostolical traditions. The superiority of Bishops is expressly styled *an apostolical tradition.*

And there is surely a wide difference between calling a custom an apostolical tradition, and commanding us to revere *as if it were* an apostolical tradition. "It is one thing for a writer to say, that for the sake of the peace and good of the church, people should look upon and observe good and innocent customs *as if they were apostolical traditions;* and another to call any thing absolutely an *apostolical tradition.* And again it is very just to call any matter of practice both an ecclesiastical custom, and an apostolical tradition, without meaning the *same thing* by both those terms."† These different modes of expression mark determinately and clearly a distinction between those customs which were founded on apostolical authority, and those which were of human origin.

* Unaquæque provincia abundet in sensu suo, et precepta majorum leges apostolicas arbitretur. Hieron. Epist. 20. ad Lucinum.

† Bishop Hoadley. Defence of Episcopal Ordination, chap. i.

JEROME does not enjoin us to account of the superiority of Bishops as *if it were* an apostolic tradition. He expressly styles it one; and it is surely very strange that they who contend so strongly for the veracity of JEROME, should contend that he meant that it was not one.

The force of the above passage, therefore, is, that by apostolic authority there is the same distinction and subordination among Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons under the gospel, that there were between the High Priest, Priests, and Levites under the law. Aaron, the High Priest, was superior to the Priests; so is a Bishop to a Presbyter. An objection to this construction is, that it makes JEROME contradict himself; as it was his design to prove that Bishop and Presbyter were by apostolic institution the same. This objection vanishes when we consider that JEROME only reasons concerning the *original* constitution of the ministry, according to which he maintains the identity of Bishop and Presbyter. He admits that a change took place, and he no where asserts that it was not effected before the death of the Apostles, or that it rests only on human authority. On the contrary, as has been already stated, there are many reasons which favour the opposite opinion.

But it has been said by STILLINGFLEET, that JEROME, in this passage, "runs the comparison not between Aaron and his sons under the law, and Bishops and Presbyters under the gospel; but between *Aaron and his sons* as *one part* of the comparison under the law, and the *Levites* under them as the *other;* so under the gospel *Bishops and Presbyters* make *one part* of the comparison, answering to Aaron and his sons in that wherein they all agree, viz. the order of the priesthood; and the *other* part under the gospel is that of *Deacons*, answering to the *Levites* under the law."* But it happens that ISIDORE, a Bishop of Seville, whom STILLINGFLEET quotes† as maintaining the same opinion with JEROME, runs a comparison between *Aaron* and his sons the *Priests*

* Stillingfleet's Irenicum, part ii. chap. 6. † Ibid.

under the law, and *Bishops* and *Presbyters* under the gospel. "To the Apostles after their death succeeded the Bishops; who are appointed throughout the whole world to the *seats of the Apostles.*" "It ought to be noted, that what Aaron the High Priest was, the same was the Bishop; his sons prefigured the Presbyters."* And in that very chapter in which STILLINGFLEET represents him as adopting JEROME's opinion, he says, when speaking of the Apostle's including Presbyters under the name Bishops, "The Apostle is silent concerning Presbyters, because he includes them in the name of Bishops; for the *second grade* is united with the first."†

This opinion of ISIDORE proves that a writer whom Bishop STILLINGFLEET represents as advocating the sentiments of JEROME, may with JEROME assert the identity of names, and yet maintain that a Bishop was a superior *grade* of the same order as a Presbyter, and possessed superior powers; and that this superiority answers to the superiority of the High Priest over the Priests in the legal dispensation. JEROME himself explicitly adopts the same opinion, and runs the comparison between Aaron and his sons under the law, and Bishops and Presbyters under the gospel. He admonishes the Presbyter *Nepotian*, "Be subject to your chief Priest," &c. and soon afterwards enforces it by this reason—"Because we ought to know that what *Aaron and his sons are*, the *same* is a *Bishop* and his *Presbyters.*"‡ If it be said, that in this passage JEROME means that Bishops were superior to Presbyters only by the *custom of his day*, with the same propriety it may be said, that in the former case, when he runs the comparison between Presbyters and Deacons, he meant to assert the superiority of the former to the latter only by the custom of the age! This is a conclusion which the advocates of Presbytery will not admit.

The warmest advocate of Episcopacy would not wish to

* Isidore, de offic. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. 5. † Cap. 7.
‡ Hieron. Epist. ad Nepotianum.

use stronger language concerning it than that which JEROME uses in the following passages.

In his fifty-fourth Epistle he distinguishes between the orthodox Christians and certain heretics, by saying, "With *us* the *Bishops* hold the *place of the Apostles*, with them the Bishop is the third degree." Here such Bishops as there were in JEROME's time, when confessedly they were superior to Presbyters, and vested with the power of ordination, "held the place of the Apostles."

More explicitly still in his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers, he *records*, as a *matter* of fact, "JAMES, immediately after our Lord's ascension, having been ORDAINED BISHOP OF JERUSALEM, undertook the charge of the church at Jerusalem. TIMOTHY was ORDAINED BISHOP *of the Ephesians by* PAUL, TITUS of *Crete*. POLYCARP was by JOHN ORDAINED BISHOP of Smyrna." Here then we have *Bishops* ordained in the churches by the Apostles themselves.

It is to no purpose to say that JEROME makes these assertions on the *authority of others*. He surely believed these assertions were supported by sufficient *historical evidence*, or he would not have made them. And he certainly was not inclined to give undue weight to testimonies that favoured the cause of Bishops. Ah! but JEROME testifying in *favour* of Episcopacy, and JEROME testifying *against* it, are two different persons! In the former case his testimony is triumphantly adduced as "a famous testimony not to be erased by any art that sophistry possesses." In the latter case we shall doubtless find much ingenuity exerted to prove that his testimony is "not worth a straw!" We shall doubtless be told that when JEROME speaks of *Bishops* as *successors to the Apostles*, and as *ordained by the Apostles*, he does not consider them as superior officers, but regards them only as *Presbyters*. What! were not Bishops superior to Presbyters in the time of JEROME? Confessedly so. And when he speaks of Bishops as ordained by the Apostles, and as being their successors, does he intimate that

he uses the term *Bishop* in any other than that *appropriate* sense in which it was applied in his day, when the Bishop was confessedly an officer superior to Presbyters, and vested with the power of ordination? No such intimation is given. And without such intimation we should be doing violence to language and to common sense to suppose, that in these cases he applied the term Bishop in any other than its appropriate sense. The language of JEROME is conformable to the language of ancient writers, particularly EUSEBIUS, who lived a short time before him, and who gives a list of Bishops as they were in his day (single persons in every church vested with the power of ordination) up to the Apostles themselves.

But we have JEROME's explicit testimony that by *Bishops being successors of the Apostles, and ordained by the Apostles*, he does not mean Presbyters, but such Bishops as were superior to Presbyters, and vested with the exclusive power of ordination.

In his commentary on the 45th Psalm, we find him asserting, "Now, because the Apostles are departed from the world, thou hast *instead* of them *Bishops*, their *sons*. They are thy fathers, because thou art governed by them." He is evidently speaking of the time present, of his own time (NOW,) when Bishops were superior to Presbyters, and vested with the power of ordination. These Bishops he represents as the "sons of the Apostles," as *succeeding to them* when they left the world.

In his Epistle to Heliodorus, "*of not undertaking the office of a Bishop*," he observes, "It is not easy to stand in the *place of Paul*, to hold the *degree of Peter*." In this Epistle he is undoubtedly considering the office of a Bishop as it was in his day; and therefore, in his judgment, the Bishop of his day, an officer distinct from and superior to Presbyters, and exercising the power of ordination, "stood in *the place of Paul*, and held the grade of Peter." Of the same purport is the passage which has been already adduced,*

* Page 187.

in which he advises the Presbyter Nepotian, "Be subject to thy chief Priest, and regard him as the parent of thy soul—What Aaron and his sons were, that we should know *Bishops* and *Presbyters* are." Here, without doubt, he refers to the Bishops and Presbyters of his day, when these officers were distinct and subordinate, and when Bishops were vested with all the powers which their advocates claim for them. These Bishops and Presbyters, according to JEROME, claim obedience by the same authority under the gospel that Aaron and his sons did under the law!

Is it credible that JEROME would have spoken of Bishops in these strong terms—such Bishops as there were in his age, when the opponents of Episcopacy acknowledge they possessed the exclusive power of ordination—is it credible that he would have spoken of them as the *successors of the Apostles*, as *ordained by the Apostles*, and as holding the *place of the Apostles*, if their "supremacy" had been of "human invention," if they had not been of apostolic authority? No! As Bishop STILLINGFLEET, not without pungency observes—"If they had come in by *usurpation*, he would have called them the successors of *Simon Magus*, of *Diotrephes*, of *Caiaphas*, and, according to his *warm manner* of expression, of *Lucifer* himself."*

It may be said, than when JEROME maintains that *James*, *Timothy*, *Titus*, and others were ordained Bishops by the Apostles, and placed over Presbyters, he contradicts himself; because, at other times he argues from the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, that Bishops and Presbyters were the same. Bishops and Presbyters were, indeed, originally names of the same office. But there was at the same time a superior grade of church officers (in which grade were Timothy and Titus,) first called Apostles, and afterwards Bishops. Still we shall be told, this could not be JEROME'S opinion, because he asserts that the church was governed at

* Stillingfleet's sermon at an ordination at St. Paul's.

first by a common council of Presbyters. We cannot account for this extraordinary declaration of JEROME, but from the warmth, the impetuosity, and hastiness of his temper. Inflamed with resentment against the Bishops and Deacons, we see him at one time endeavouring to prove from the apostolic Epistles, that there was no supremacy of Bishops to Presbyters. At other times, attending only to the strong evidence of historical fact, we find him asserting, that the Apostles themselves ordained Bishops—such Bishops as existed in his own time, when their supremacy was certainly acknowledged. I am no ways interested in clearing up an inconsistency which destroys entirely "the famous testimony of JEROME." No person would think of resting his cause on a witness whose declarations, to say the least, are dubious and perplexed, if not contradictory.

It is, however, of importance to observe, that when JEROME maintains the original parity of the ministry, he does not appeal to any *record*, to any satisfactory historical evidence, but *reasons* from the identity of the names of Bishop and Presbyter.* The real question is, not whether these names are in scripture applied to the same grade of the ministry, which is granted; but whether there was not a superior grade to them to which, after the apostolic times, the term Bishop has been exclusively applied. If we discard an attention to "*names*, which are of little real value,"† and attend to "things for which alone we should contend," it is evident beyond dispute, that Timothy and Titus were vested with the powers of ordination and government; were authorized to ordain and govern Presbyters (called also, as overseers of the flock, Bishops;) and of course were superior to them. We can thus get over the *reasoning* of JEROME; we can

* Wherever he asserts the original parity of the ministry, or rather of Bishops and Presbyters, he argues from the identity of names, from the circumstance that in scripture the names, Bishop and Presbyter are applied to the same office.

† Mr. M'Leod's Ecclesiastical Catechism.

prove the fallacy of his opinion. His statement concerning the original parity of the ministry is a matter of *opinion* founded on reasoning which may be proved fallacious.

But the opponents of Episcopacy who confide in JEROME as a credible witness, cannot consistently reject his *testimony*. And he expressly asserts, as a *matter of fact*, that "*Timothy* was *ordained* Bishop of Ephesus, Titus of Crete, St. James of Jerusalem, and Polycarp of Smyrna, by the Apostles;" using the term Bishop in the appropriate sense of his own age, to denote a grade of ministers superior to Presbyters. It may be said, that these are facts prior to the time of JEROME, of which he could not have been an eye witness. So was the alleged change from Presbytery to Episcopacy. The opponents of Episcopacy receive JEROME's *reasonings* as authority in favour of this change; they surely cannot reject his *testimony*, founded on historical evidence, in the former case. But, it is said, the two cases are contradictory! If, then, two statements of any witness are contradictory, and we wish to preserve his consistency, we must give up that statement which is a matter of *opinion and reasoning*, and receive that which he alleges as a *matter of fact*. Now, JEROME in some parts of his writings asserts that there was originally a parity in the ministry, and *reasons* in support of his assertion from the identity of the names of Bishop and Presbyter. His statement here, then, is a matter of *opinion*, entitled to no credit with those who believe the reasoning which supports it fallacious. But when he asserts, that St. JAMES was *ordained Bishop* of Jerusalem, TIMOTHY of Ephesus, TITUS of Crete, and POLYCARP of Smyrna, by the APOSTLES—here is his testimony to a matter of fact, founded on what must have been to him satisfactory *historical evidence*. This testimony ought to be conclusive with you, Sir, who rest on JEROME as a *credible witness*. The common rules of evidence, therefore, will compel you to give up JEROME's *opinion*, founded on *reasoning* which may be fallacious, and to receive his *testimony* to a matter of fact, founded on satisfactory historical evidence,

that the Apostles ordained Bishops over Presbyters in the churches.*

I have dwelt thus long on what you are pleased to term "the famous testimony of JEROME," in order to show to what a desperate expedient the advocates of Presbytery are driven to support their cause. The supremacy of Bishops in the fourth century is universally acknowledged. To prove this supremacy an innovation, they rely on a Father who lived at least two centuries after the time when, by their own confession, it must have taken place; while Fathers, and ecclesiastical writers who preceded him, and who narrate minute events and schisms in the church, are silent concerning this most improbable and extraordinary innovation. So far also from being a credible witness, the Father on whom they rely was urged, by personal motives and feelings of resentment, to lower as much as possible the authority of Bishops. His declaration that their supremacy was a change in the original order of the church, is unworthy of the name of testimony. It is a matter of *opinion*, founded on fallacious reasoning. His *testimony*, which is founded on *historical evidence*, is decisive, that Bishops, as superior to Presbyters, are successors of the Apostles, who themselves ordained Bishops in the churches. There is no way of rendering the statements of JEROME consistent, but by supposing that this change, which he fancies, was sanctioned by apostolic authority. If this mode of reconciling his declarations be not admitted, still he does not in the least degree favour the cause of parity. His declarations in favour of the apostolic supremacy of Bishops, are at least as

* It may be said that JEROME rests principally on the historian EUSEBIUS, who acknowledges that it is difficult to determine the *particular* Bishops who succeeded the Apostles. EUSEBIUS, however, is explicit as to the fact that the *supremacy of Bishops* is an *apostolic institution*. And surely if this supremacy had been an innovation or usurpation, there would have been, in his day at least, some *tradition* of this extraordinary event. The dispute as to the *particular order* in which some of the apostolic Bishops succeeded each other, incontestibly proves the fact that there were Bishops in the apostolic age.

numerous and decisive as those against it. On the supposition most unfavorable to Episcopalians, Jerome contradicts himself; and thus his "famous testimony" is "not worth a straw."

But had the opinion of JEROME been direct and positive, had he asserted in the most explicit terms that Episcopacy was "a human invention," no candid Presbyterian should urge his testimony. He lived at too distant a period from the apostolic age. He was biassed by personal feelings and prejudices. It is incredible that so important and extraordinary a change as that from Presbytery to Episcopacy should have universally taken place in the church without the most full and positive testimony concerning it. It would not have been left to the *single* testimony of a Father who wrote at the close of the fourth century.

The opponents of Episcopacy gain nothing by relying on JEROME. They lose much. They admit the weakness of their cause, by resting on the judgment of a Father who lived so late as the fourth century, and who cannot be considered as a *credible witness*, or an *impartial reasoner*. They admit that long before his time (for he gives not the most distant hint of its being a recent event) the supremacy of Bishops over Presbyters was established. They thus concede to Episcopacy the venerable sanction of primitive and universal usage. They bring on themselves the burden of proving how Episcopacy could have universally prevailed within a few years of the apostolic age, if it had not been sanctioned by apostolic authority. But, most mortifying circumstance, they cast a blot black as midnight on their darling Presbytery; they pass the highest encomium on this hated Prelacy. In relying on JEROME, they admit that Episcopacy was brought in as "a remedy for schism;" they admit that Presbytery proved incompetent to preserving the unity of the church; that so lamentable were its defects and inconveniences, that the primitive Christians were obliged to throw it off, and to seek repose for their dis-

tracted church, so long tossed on the tempestuous billows of Presbytery, in the peaceful haven of Episcopacy. Yes—as Dr. MAURICE shrewdly and keenly remarks,* "If the Presbyterian parity had any place in the primitive times, as some do imagine, it must needs have been an *intolerable kind of government*, since all on a sudden it was universally abolished. It must have given strange occasion of offence when all the Christian churches in the world should conspire to abrogate this polity, and to *destroy all the memory and footsteps of it*."

---

## LETTER XIII.

SIR,

So palpable is the evidence that the primitive church was Episcopal, that some of the opponents of Episcopacy in modern times have had recourse to a singular hypothesis to overthrow it. The hypothesis to which I allude is that of *Congregational Episcopacy*. The advocates of this plan allow that there were Bishops in the primitive church, but maintain that they were only Bishops of a single congregation. They allow that ST. JAMES was Bishop of Jerusalem, that IGNATIUS was Bishop of Antioch, that CYPRIAN was Bishop of Carthage. But they maintain that in those cities, and in all others in which a Bishop was placed for the three first centuries, there was only one congregation! This scheme carries on its face its refutation! It is incredible that, at a period when Christianity had spread itself throughout the world, the most large and populous cities should not have contained more Christians than could assemble in one place for worship. In the Apostles' times, the church of *Jerusalem* consisted at first of "*an hundred and twenty*."† To these were

* Vindication of the Government of the Primitive Church, in answer to BAXTER, p. 363, 369

† Acts i. 15

added "about *three thousand souls*,"* and afterwards "men to the number of *five thousand*."† "Still the word of God increased, and the number of disciples *multiplied* greatly in Jerusalem,"‡ until at length the Elders addressed Paul, "Thou seest, brother, how *many thousands* (myriads) of Jews there are which believe."§ It is impossible that these could have assembled in one place for worship. At this period too Christians held their public service in private. The number of congregations must therefore have been very great. In each of these congregations there must have been a minister to conduct its worship. Here then was a church, over which ST. JAMES evidently presided, consisting of several congregations and ministers.

In like manner, at *Antioch*, we are told that a "great number believed and turned unto the Lord;"‖ "much people were added unto the Lord."¶ It is incredible that in this large and populous city, the greatest city in the East, where the converts to the Gospel increased so much, that they were there first emboldened to throw off the reproachful names with which their adversaries had designated them, and to assume the name of *Christians*—it is incredible that in this city the number of Christians should not have amounted to more than could assemble in one place for worship! And yet considerable ingenuity has been exercised to prove, by affixing a literal meaning to some expressions in the Epistles of IGNATIUS, which ought to be understood figuratively, that IGNATIUS, who was the Bishop of this city, was only the Pastor of *one congregation!*

It is still more incredible that for three centuries the gospel should have made so little progress, that in the city of *Carthage* and its vicinity there should be but one congregation of Christians. And yet the advocates of Congregational Episcopacy have contended that the venerable CYPRIAN, the

* Acts ii. 41. † Acts iv. 4. ‡ Acts vi. 7. § Acts xxi. 20.
‖ Acts xi. 21. ¶ Acts xi. 24.

Bishop of Carthage in the third century, was only the Pastor of a single congregation!

To spend time in exposing these monstrous suppositions, which carry with them their own refutation, would be useless. To this form of government, indeed, neither the Presbyterian nor Congregational form in the present day bears resemblance. A Presbyterian and Congregational Bishop is the only Pastor in the congregation who has the ministry of the word and sacraments; whereas a primitive Bishop, who some opponents of Episcopacy contend was only the Pastor of one congregation, had several Presbyters under him, who were vested with all the ministerial powers! What need could CYPRIAN have had of several Presbyters? What need could CORNELIUS, his cotemporary Bishop of Rome, have had of forty-six Presbyters and several Deacons, if he were the Pastor of only a single congregation?

This scheme of Congregational Episcopacy, the invention of CARTWRIGHT, CLARKSON, and BAXTER, in the seventeenth century, is as hostile to Presbytery as it is to Diocesan Episcopacy. It makes every PASTOR and his congregation an independent church, subject to no higher church authority. It is, therefore, not only calculated to generate and to nourish heresy and schism, but it flies in the face of scripture testimony; according to which the churches were governed by a council of "Apostles and Elders."* It is therefore opposed with as much zeal by genuine Presbyterians as by Episcopalians. It was opposed by the Westminster Assembly of Divines when it was first started, and has ever since been opposed by the advocates of Presbytery. Mr. M'LEOD, in his Ecclesiastical Catechism, disclaims it. He conclusively proves that the term Church is applied not only to a single Pastor and his congregation, but to a number of Pastors and their congregations united together in a common church judicatory; and that this church, in the large cities

* Acts xv 6.

of Jerusalem, Ephesus, &c. consisted of Pastors and congregations thus united. With him indeed the bond of union is a PRESBYTERY; but with Churchmen, a superior officer, called after the apostolic age by the appropriate title of BISHOP. Such superior officers they contend were ST. JAMES at *Jerusalem*, and TIMOTHY and TITUS at *Ephesus* and *Crete*.

That the dioceses or seats of jurisdiction of the Bishops in the primitive church embraced several Presbyters and their congregations, has been incontestibly proved by Dr. MAURICE, in his treatises on Diocesan Episcopacy against CLARKSON and BAXTER, and by the learned BINGHAM, in his Ecclesiastical Antiquities. The former particularly gives an account of the seats of jurisdiction of the Bishops during the first three centuries, and proves from their geographical extent, their population and other circumstances, that they included several congregations with Presbyters over them.

Grant to the Episcopalian that the supremacy of Bishops prevailed throughout the primitive church in the third or beginning of the fourth century, and he contends that this is sufficient evidence of its being an apostolic institution: and for this obvious reason; the Apostles certainly constituted a ministry in the church. This supremacy of Bishops therefore must have been either of apostolic institution, or it must have been an innovation or usurpation. If it had been an *innovation* or *usurpation* on apostolic order, it could not have received universal sanction at a period so near the apostolic age, without *opposition*, and without the most explicit and marked *record* of so extraordinary a change or usurpation. But no such record appears; no tradition even of any such event is mentioned in any of the writers of the three first centuries. No such change or usurpation, therefore, could have taken place in the constitution of the primitive church. The supremacy of Bishops, therefore, which universally prevailed in the third or beginning of the fourth century, could not have been an *innovation* or *usurpation*. It must, therefore, have been an *apostolic institution*.

This reasoning is irrefragable. It is worthy of further developement and consideration.

The concessions of BLONDEL, CHAMIER, BOCHART, and other Presbyterian writers, would authorize me in assuming the second century as the era of the universal prevalence of the supremacy of Bishops in the church. But let the age of CYPRIAN, Bishop of Carthage, in the third century, be assumed as the era when Episcopacy universally prevailed in the church. There is, indeed, irrefragable proof of the distinction and subordination of the three grades of the ministry, and of the supremacy of Bishops, with the power of ordination, in the time of CYPRIAN. In the church of Carthage, of which CYPRIAN was Bishop, he enumerates at least eight Presbyters. It has been already stated, that CORNELIUS, the Bishop of Rome, who was cotemporary with CYPRIAN, had under him forty-six Presbyters, and seven Deacons. The Bishop in the age of CYPRIAN, was advanced from the degree of Presbyter by a *new ordination*.* BLONDEL and SALMA-

* The following proof of this fact is taken from Dr. BOWDEN's *first letter to Dr.* STILES: "ST. CYPRIAN was first a Presbyter, and then ordained Bishop of Carthage, according to his Deacon PONTIUS, EUSEBIUS, and ST. JEROME.† Thus, ST. CYPRIAN tells us, that 'CORNELIUS had advanced gradually through all the inferior stations before he was a Bishop; and when he was promoted to the See of Rome, sixteen Bishops attended his ordination. Ep. lv. p. 103–112.'" "Nay, the necessity of *a new ordination* for raising one to the Episcopal dignity was so notorious, that the schismatics themselves believed it indispensable, as appears from the story of NOVATIAN, who was a Presbyter. When he contended with CORNELIUS for the See of Rome, he got three simple country Bishops to come to the city, and having intoxicated them, forced them to give him the Episcopal mission by an imaginary and vain imposition of hands. (Euseb. l. 6. c. 43.) Thus also FORTUNATUS, one of the five Presbyters who joined with the schismatical FELICISSIMUS, and who set himself up as an anti-Bishop at Carthage, was ordained by five false Bishops. (Ep. lix. p. 113.)

"Now, if a Bishop in ST. CYPRIAN's time was no more than a Presbyter, what need was there of so much work about him? Why, for example, convene all the Bishops of the province for the ordination of a Pres-

† "Pontius in vita Cyp.—Euseb. Chron.—Hierome Catal."

sius, two of the most distinguished opponents of Episcopacy, acknowledge, that in the "time of Cyprian (and long before it, ever since the distinction was made between Bishops and Presbyters,) *Bishops and Presbyters were promoted by distinct ordinations, and made distinct colleges.*" * It is, however, conceded on all hands, that the supremacy of Bishops universally prevailed in the church in the time of Eusebius and Jerome, who lived in the next century after Cyprian. Had it not also prevailed in the time of Cyprian, we should find in them some record of the fact.

Take then the third century as the period when Episcopacy universally prevailed in the church. Its establishment must have been by *apostolic institution*, or by *innovation and*

byter in Carthage, where there were eight Presbyters at least to have performed the business? Why was there a convention of sixteen Bishops to ordain the Presbyter Cornelius Bishop of Rome, when there were forty-six Presbyters in that city? Further, Were not Cornelius and Novatianus Presbyters of Rome before the *former* was the *true*, and the *latter* the *false* Bishop of that city? If so, what need of a new election, and a new ordination of Presbyters of a church of which they were Presbyters already? How superlatively ridiculous must it have been, to have seen two eminent men, already Presbyters of Rome, making so much work about being made Presbyters of Rome? And all the clergy and the people of Rome, nay, sooner or later all the Christian world, engaged in the quarrel? What had this been but the very quintessence of folly and nonsense?"

* Bishop Sage, in proof of the above, quotes, in his *Vindication of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age*, the following passages from Blondel and Salmasius: "Formam a precedente (*n. forma, qua promove bantur Episcopi*) aliam, analogia eadem semper manente (ex quo distinctis cleri gradibus, diversa Episcoporum et Presbyterorum collegia instituere per ecclesiam visum est) inducere necesse fuit." Apol. p. 162.

"Ubi distingui ordines et gradus cœpti sunt, atque Episcopus major extitit Presbytero, tum ordinatio non potuit esse utriusque communis: Ut enim major ordinat minorem, superior inferiorem, ita e contrario, minor ordinare majorem non potest, neque inferior superiorem: Inde igitur postquam minor Episcopo factus est Presbyter, ex ordinum discretione, non potuit minor ordinare majorem, hoc est, Presbyter Episcopum. Sic Episcopo ordinatio propria facta est, et ad Presbyterum desiit pertinere, quia Presbyter destitit esse Episcopus." Wal. Mess. p 288, 299.

*usurpation*. The opponents of Episcopacy assert that Episcopacy is an innovation or usurpation which took place at some period within the three first centuries. This *innovation or usurpation is incredible*, for the following reasons.

The *piety* of the primitive church forbids the supposition. The Fathers of the three first centuries, whatever were their talents or their learning, were *good men*. They glorified their Saviour in the midst of flames and tortures; they laid down their life for the testimony of Jesus. Would these holy martyrs have permitted the ministry instituted by their Lord and his blessed Apostles to be fundamentally altered? Would they have basely violated the institutions of their Saviour?

There would have been no *possible motive* to this usurpation.

Allowing that the primitive Fathers were bad men; men swayed solely by inordinate ambition and lust of power. In the primitive church there was no food for these passions. During the first ages persecution stretched his bloody sceptre over the church. Christians served their Saviour with their tears and with their blood. The stations of authority afforded no attractions of wealth or honour. They were the sure paths to the dungeon, to the rack and to the stake. Those who filled them were marked as the first and most worthy objects of the rage of those tyrants who hoped to drown the church in the blood of her children. It would be the height of folly to suppose, that under such circumstances any Presbyters, however inordinate their ambition, would seek distinction on the rack and at the stake, would usurp stations where relentless persecution would inevitably assail them.

There were *insuperable difficulties* to the effecting of this alleged innovation or usurpation.

Admitting that there were Presbyters in the primitive church *wicked* enough to form a plan of usurpation, and *foolish* enough thus to court dangers and death, how was the usurpation to be effected? By intrigue? *Intrigue* requires

*concert* in planning, and *length of time* for operation. But this usurpation must have been universally effected at a time when Christianity had extended itself throughout the world. And could that *concert*, which is necessary to devising and successfully prosecuting any plan of difficult intrigue, have taken place among Presbyters scattered through distant regions, at a period too when there were no general councils which collected together the deputies of the churches? Was there *time* for devising and executing a plan of intrigue which subverted the apostolic ministry within a short period after the apostolic age?

Could the usurpation have been effected by *violence*, or by the force of authority? But the usurping Presbyters had neither the wealth nor the power of the world to aid them in their ambitious projects; nor were there any general councils to enforce this usurpation by an authoritative decree. Without any adequate means, these usurpers were to contend against the institutions of Christ and his Apostles, against a ministry endeared to the hearts of Christians as the divinely commissioned servants of their Master. Yes—whether *intrigue* or *authority* were the weapons of usurpation, these usurping Presbyters had to contend against the attachment of the great body of Christians to the form of a ministry bearing the sacred seal of apostolic authority. Say you the primitive Christians were careless about violating apostolic institutions! What! did not a difference of opinion concerning the apostolic tradition of the time of observing Easter throw them into the most serious disputes and schisms? Must they not have cherished with infinitely greater reverence that ministry which, instituted by the Apostles, had embodied itself with their religion, with every service and solemnity of the church, with their dearest hopes? These *usurping* Presbyters also had to contend against the love of power in their fellow Presbyters; against that sacred attachment to the authority which they possessed, founded on the conviction that it was a deposit intrusted to them by

their divine Master. Would not an usurpation effected under such circumstances, not in one particular province but throughout all nations, not advancing gradually in strength and extent through the lapse of several centuries, but rising into full maturity, and stretching its iniquitous sceptre over the whole world in less than two centuries after the apostolic age—would not such an usurpation be without a parallel, contrary to common sense, to every principle of human nature, to the voice of universal experience?

Nor could this change in the government of the church have been effected by *general consent*.

The supposition of the opponents of Episcopacy is, that the Apostles left the church, under Presbyterian government, subject to common councils of Presbyters, without any higher order. Is it credible then that a government instituted by the inspired Apostles should, in a short time, prove so defective or intolerable as to compel both Presbyters and Laity throughout the Christian world to change this government? What is the alleged reason of this change? The divisions among Christians—the people saying, I am of Paul, I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and every Presbyter ranking as his own disciples those whom he had baptized. Is it credible that the people and the Presbyters should *universally consent* to correct their own inflamed party zeal, and curb their own inordinate ambition? Is it credible "that the Presbyters, while they were thus fond of raising their own names, met together in order to remedy this which they themselves were fond of, and did unanimously agree upon a method to remedy it?" Is it credible "that the laity, while they were thus addicted to particular Presbyters, did quietly, and without any opposition acquiesce in what was prescribed for the remedying of an evil which they did not desire should be remedied? A matter too absurd, one would think, to be believed by any who know any thing about human nature."*

* Bishop HOADLEY.

Some of the virtuous Presbyters may indeed have formed a plan for checking this ambitious and disorganizing spirit; and some of the most considerate among the laity may have been disposed to acquiesce in it. But how could this plan have been carried into effect *universally*, in distant and remote parts of the world? No general council having met, there could not have been any general concert in devising an uniform system, nor any general authority to enforce what must have been a most unpopular change. Is it credible that the ambitious Presbyters, and schismatic laity who must have been the *multitude*, inflamed as they must have been by pride and party zeal, would universally and peaceably acquiesce in measures to curb their power and abridge their liberties, would consent to exalt into a superior station a prime Presbyter, or Bishop, who, trampling on the equal rights of Presbyters, would appear on his unhallowed throne as a tyrant and usurper? What reasons, what persuasions, nay, what violence could reach over remote and distant nations, and silence the voice and the arm of Presbyters and people exerted in the defence of their power and privileges, exerted in defence of rights secured to them by apostolical institution? What voice mighty enough to say to the tempest of religious phrensy roused in defence of popular right sanctioned by apostolic authority—Peace, be still! Instances indeed there have been of the people, in *some one* nation long tossed on the billows of anarchy, at length quietly sinking into the calm of despotism. But here was an instance of a revolution peaceably acquiesced in throughout the world, by those whose ambition, whose pride, whose just rights it subverted—a revolution so complete and universal as to leave not a vestige of the apostolic institutions, the overthrow of which it had accomplished! Impossible—that Presbyters and people would part with rights and institutions bearing the seal of apostolic authority, and consecrated by the blood of martyrs! "Never was any matter of fact parallel to this known in history; unless it be that there are

many persons of later ages who can greedily believe such an improbable *conjecture* as certain truth, without one competent express testimony to support it. Let us put any of these persons themselves into the place of the *primitive Presbyters*, governing the churches by their common councils; knowing that they were left in this office, and directed how to perform it by the Apostles themselves; affecting to have disciples called by their own names—and we may make themselves judges whether they would voluntarily and professedly have met together with a design of remedying their own vanity; whether they would have done this by divesting themselves of the exercise of powers to which they had been called by the Apostles themselves. Nay, whether if they had been outvoted in this matter, they would have silently yielded without so much as alleging for themselves the just plea which they would have had against this alteration," that it was a violation of apostolic institutions. "That this great alteration should be contrived and effected, and universally submitted to, by the very persons whose designs and humours and vain affectation it was ordained to remedy, and put a stop to, is the strangest and most unaccountable thing imaginable."*

But the advocates of Episcopacy will concede all that can be required of them. They will concede that such a change was practicable; that it could have been effected by general consent, or by gradual usurpation.

Still it is incredible that this change or usurpation in the government and ministry of the church was actually effected, because there is no *explicit and satisfactory record* or account of it.

Whether effected by violence, by gradual usurpation, or by general consent, it would have been a fundamental change—a change that would have entirely altered the features of the church. It would have constituted a new and marked era in her history. We would surely expect to find

* Bishop HOADLEY's Defence of Episcopal Ordination.

in cotemporary writers some notices of an event, one of the most extraordinary that could have occurred. But we search the ecclesiastical writers of the three first centuries. Not even any faint traces of this change or usurpation is to be found in them. The venerable IGNATIUS, the disciple of the Apostle ST. JOHN; IRENEUS, the disciple of POLYCARP, the cotemporary of IGNATIUS; CLEMENS of Alexandria; and the celebrated TERTULLIAN, all of whom flourished in the second century, afford us no light in tracing this change or usurpation, in ascertaining either its gradual advances or the bold and sudden assault by which it subverted apostolic order, and mounted to universal dominion. Equally silent as to this most momentous occurrence are ORIGEN and CYPRIAN, Fathers of the third century. But perhaps EUSEBIUS, the historian of the fourth century, affords irrefragable evidence of it. Alas! EUSEBIUS, to whom, even if every record of preceding times had been swept away, tradition would have handed down some account of this memorable innovation on apostolic order, is silent concerning it. He gives not the most distant hint that the supremacy of Bishops, which was universal in his day, had any other origin than apostolic institution. The "famous testimony of JEROME" is the "forlorn hope" of those who impeach Episcopacy as an innovation. And lo! when we open JEROME, we find his "famous testimony" is a matter of *opinion*, and that in many passages he expressly records the apostolic institution of the supremacy of Bishops. But were the testimony of JEROME clear as "the sun shining in his strength," it would not be worthy of a moment's credit, standing as it does single, and unsupported even by any faint hint of those writers who lived nearer to the period of this alleged change, and some of whom must have been cotemporary with it.

Suppose, sir, that the whole Christian world were now bending under the *gentle sway* of Presbytery—that the conviction was universal, that this "is the true and only government which God has prescribed in his word." By what in-

trigue, by what violence, by what magic could Presbyterians throughout the world be induced or compelled to exchange their divinely constituted government for the yoke of an usurping Prelacy? By what intrigue, by what violence, by what magic could the Moderators of Presbyteries wrest from these Presbyteries the power of ordination, and persuade Presbyterians throughout the world to admit, as valid, Episcopal ordination only? Still greater would be the prodigy that this unparalleled revolution should be effected, and yet find no place in the pages of cotemporary writers! Say not that we know little of the primitive ages of the church; that but few of the writings of those ages have survived the ravages of time. We do know all the leading events of the primitive church; we possess many of the writings of her early Fathers. They narrate comparatively trifling changes and schisms. Would they have been silent concerning one, compared with which all others are but as the petty contentions of an obscure village to a revolution that shakes empires, and changes the destiny of the world?*

No, sir, the rise of the monster Prelacy would have been narrowly watched and minutely traced. Envy, jealousy, pride, and the love of power would have conspired to check

* I am aware that it may be said, that the art of printing having facilitated the means of communication, Christians could in modern times be more speedily and effectually roused to oppose innovation; and the records of any extraordinary event would be greatly multiplied. But, on the contrary, printing being unknown in the primitive age, any change in apostolic order which took place in one part of the Christian world would be less likely to be speedily known or adopted in other parts distant and remote. There is, therefore, from this circumstance, more difficulty in accounting for the *uniformity* in this change, and for the *suddenness* of its accomplishment through every part of the Christian church. But the fact is, many of the writings of the primitive Fathers are still extant; and surely there could have been no event which they would have been more likely to record than a change in apostolic order, which, whether gradual or sudden, whether effected by general consent or usurpation, must have impressed them most forcibly, and in some way or other, insinuated itself into their writings.

his usurpations, and to proclaim them to the world. Piety would have raised a rampart to his unhallowed designs not easily to be surmounted. The period, however, when, arrived to full stature, he crushed under his giant arm apostolic Presbytery, would have been marked by every ecclesiastical writer as the most memorable era in the annals of the church.

Say not that *Popery* affords a parallel to this alleged usurpation of Episcopacy. The advances of the "man of sin" are scarcely discernible in the three first centuries. The papal pretensions were not established until long after this period. Secular wealth and power were the ladders by which he mounted to pre-eminence. His pretensions were promoted and enforced by general councils. His usurpations can be traced in the faithful page of history. The opposition to his unfounded pretensions is recorded. And it was only in the *Western Church* that his claims to supreme prerogative were respected. The numerous and extensive *Eastern* or *Greek Church* always spurned his authority.

But by the confession of its opponents, Episcopacy was universally established at the commencement of the fourth century. If the supremacy of Bishops were an innovation or usurpation, it must have been effected without the aid of secular wealth or power, without the authoritative influence of general councils. Episcopacy must have subverted Presbytery throughout the world, at a time when not more than two generations had passed away since the apostolic age; when some persons must have been living whose forefathers, at not more than two or three removes, must have witnessed the apostolic institution of Presbytery! What renders the difference between the encroachments of Popery and the alleged usurpations of Episcopacy more striking, the former are distinctly traced by cotemporary writers in every period of their gradual progress; and the pen of history has recorded the opposition made to them, and the struggles by which they finally triumphed. But of the innovations or usurpa-

tions of Episcopacy, cotemporary writers are silent. Even its adversaries are compelled to fix the period of its full growth in the third, or commencement of the fourth century; and preceding or cotemporary writers afford no light as to its progress, as to the opposition which it must have encountered, or the means by which it marched to universal dominion. Striking also is the difference in another respect. While the supremacy of the Pope, triumphing over opposition by intrigue, by secular influence, by authoritative decrees of councils, has been uniformly rejected by the extensive Eastern of Greek Church, *Episcopacy*, in three centuries after the Apostles, found its *apostolic* institution *universally acknowledged*. The heretics in their contests with the orthodox, never thought of returning to this supposed apostolic Presbytery, but deemed it essential to obtain Bishops. In the unhappy contests that often attended the election of Bishops, no one ever impeached their apostolic supremacy, or suggested, as a remedy for the convulsions which their election occasioned, that primitive Presbytery from which it is supposed Christians had departed. Not one church was to be found which preserved it. Scattered as Christians were through distant regions, they all bowed to the sway of EPISCOPACY. And an ambitious and disappointed Presbyter,* who, about two hundred years after the times of the Apostles by whom it is supposed Presbyterian regimen was instituted, presumed to deny the apostolic supremacy of Bishops, was branded as a MADMAN!!

This then, sir, is a fact which, of itself, demonstrates the apostolic institution of Episcopacy. According to the unanimous concession of its opponents, it universally prevailed at the commencement of the fourth century.† It must either have originated in the *institution* of the Apostles who were

* AERIUS, who, like his predecessor ARIUS, denied the divinity of Christ.

† This is the latest period. Many of the most learned Presbyterians acknowledge that Episcopacy prevailed in the second century.

divinely commissioned to constitute the church, or it must have been an *innovution* or *usurpation*. WHEN, HOW was this most extraordinary change in the apostolic constitution of the church effected? What were the wonderful causes that could lead Presbyters and people, throughout the Christian world, to renounce rights and prerogatives vested in them by the Apostles, and to submit to the supremacy of Bishops? What were the means by which a few ambitious Presbyters in different and distant regions, in an age when they commanded neither wealth, honour, nor power; when, persecuted by the secular arm, they lived only in the affections of the people—what were the means by which they usurped supreme prerogative and crushed opposition? How could this usurpation, even if effected in one province, have extended itself throughout the world, at a period when the secular power would not have enforced it, when there was no general council to establish it? Above all, where is the explicit and irrefragable RECORD in cotemporary writers of a change, which, if effected by *general consent*, must have given new features to the visible church, and constituted one of its most memorable eras? Where the record of a change, which, if effected by *usurpation*, must have rallied clergy and people around their just rights, consecrated by apostolic authority, and called forth at least from some one degraded Presbyter a solemn protest, which, sounding loud and deep, would have been heard through distant climes to distant ages? Where the "VOICE OF WARNING," which, even in this degenerate day, poured forth the alarm in ZION when danger only remotely threatened her sacred cause? Alas! the inhabitants of Zion lay locked in deadly slumber. The sentinels on her sacred ramparts were sleeping at their posts. The enemy came. No blast from the gospel trumpet swept over Zion to rouse her members to defend her apostolic order. Presbytery, her revered pride and glory, vanished as "the baseless fabric of a vision." A corrupt "Prelacy" raised its hideous form. Christians *throughout the world*

who, but a century or two before, had received Presbytery as a sacred deposit from Christ and his Apostles, as if touched by the wand of enchantment, fell down and worshipped the image which the pride and ambition of usurping prelates had set up! And, more astonishing prodigy still! the pen of history was palsied, and left to future ages no traces of this memorable event! The man who believes that this astonishing change in apostolic order could have been universally effected within a short period of the apostolic age, without being fully and deeply recorded in the writings of that period which are now extant, is, I think, prepared to say, that all the Presbyteries now in the world may "lie down and sleep, and wake up" under the government of Bishops, and no record appear of the astonishing phenomenon!

---

## LETTER XIV.

SIR,

COMMON sense, then, indignantly rejects the supposition that Episcopacy is an *innovation* or *usurpation;* it must have been an *apostolic institution.*

Episcopacy being thus supported by SCRIPTURE and ANTIQUITY, every Christian is bound to submit to it as the institution of that divine and supreme Lawgiver who vested the Apostles with authority to institute a ministry to be continued by succession to the end of the world. Duty, gratitude, interest, all forbid the believer to violate any of the institutions of his blessed Lord and Master. The most solemn obligations, the most powerful motives, urge him to avoid that "gainsaying of Corah," that rejection of the authorized ministry of the church, in which crime the Apostle* represents some Christians as "perishing." This crime the believer

* Jude.

with certainty avoids while he communes with that ministry which even its opponents concede is *valid;* and which subsists in a church freed from papal usurpations, in which it is possible to be "valiant for the truth," and to "exemplify all the loveliness of the Christian character." In communion with this ministry he avoids all those perplexing doubts and apprehensions concerning the validity of those ministrations by which the blessings of the covenant are to be sealed to him, which no prudent man would choose to encounter, when it is in his power to avoid them. True believers, when their rejection of the authorized ministry is "unavoidable or involuntary," when they thus sin only through "ignorance or infirmity," will be accepted "in the name of the Lord Jesus," "who bought them with his blood." But as their obedience would be greater, may we not conclude their rewards in heaven, through the merits of their Saviour, will also be greater, when they receive the "seals of the covenant" from those who are "lawfully called" to administer them?*

The guilt of *schism* and the duty of *Christian unity* are enforced in the strongest terms by our blessed Saviour and his Apostles. It was the prayer of our blessed Lord, that his church might be ONE.† There is but "one body," of which he is the "head." The Apostle Paul, by the most striking *similitudes*,‡ by the most affectionate *exhortations*,§ by the most impressive *warnings*,‖ inculcates and urges the duty of preserving the UNITY of the church, and of avoiding the guilt of SCHISM. The *unity* of the church can be preserved, and the guilt of *schism* avoided, only by continuing in the "Apostles' fellowship,"¶ by communing with that ministry who derive their power by regular transmission from the Apostles. Such a ministry (even its adversaries

* See pages 65, 66.
† John xvii. 11.
‡ 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13, 27. Eph. iv. 3–6.
§ 1 Cor i. 10. Phil. ii. 1, 2. Rom. xv. 6. 2 Cor. xiii. 11.
‖ 1 Cor. iii. 3, 4. Gal. v. 19, 20, 21.
¶ Acts ii. 42.

being judges) is the Episcopal ministry. It is at least a *disputed point*, whether the claims of any other ministry be equally good. By communing then with the Episcopal ministry, the believer *certainly* avoids that *schism* so solemnly denounced, and maintains that *unity* so solemnly enjoined, by Christ and his Apostles. He certainly avoids those *divisions* which often bring in "heresy" and "every evil work;" which tend to alienate from each other the followers of the same adorable Lord; which furnish the enemies of the gospel and of the Protestant faith with their most plausible and popular arguments; and which exhibit the spiritual Zion as rent and divided, the scorn of her enemies, instead of being ONE like her divine Head, at unity in herself and the joy of the whole earth.*

The *churchman* is satisfied even from the concessions of his adversaries, that he enjoys a valid ministry and ordinances, that he maintains Christian unity, and avoids the sin of schism. The doctrines of his church, as contained in the articles and liturgy, even by the confessions of its opponents, are as evangelical as its ministry is apostolic. It is the obvious dictate of prudence to adhere inflexibly to a church which he is assured will be to him a "nursery for the church in heaven," provided he be "diligent in making his calling and election sure," in "adorning the doctrine of God his Saviour in all things."

Where, sir, is the proof of your boast,† that the "visible unity of the church" is preserved by Presbyterian regimen, by "perfect *equality of rank* among her ministers?" Is this proof to be found in the almost infinite number of sects

* The above argument would not be good in the mouth of an advocate of Popery, because the Papal Church prescribes *sinful terms of communion.**

† Christian's Magazine, Introduction, p. 12, 13.

* Besides Popery itself is a departure from the *commanded unity* of the *apostolic* church; and embodies in its corrupt system, as history shows, the most prolific elements of *schism*.—ED.

which sprung from Presbytery in the time of OLIVER CROMWELL?* Or does this proof exist in the state of the Presbyterian churches in *Scotland* or in *this country*? In *Scotland* the SECEDERS are a numerous body, who separated from the *parent church*, charging her with being a corrupt church. We find there that Presbyterian government did not preserve the visible unity of the church. Was *unity* preserved among these Seceders, who carried with them Presbyterian government, "perfect equality of rank among ministers?" In the space of a few years after the Secession they split into the two sects of *Burghers* and *Anti-Burghers;* the former so called from their submitting to what is called the *Burgher oath*, which the latter refuses to take, as inconsistent with the principles of the Secession. Here then are three distinct Presbyterian churches, who formally excommunicated one another, and disclaim all church fellowship! Admirable specimen of the efficacy of Presbyterian government in preserving the visible unity of the church! But this is not all. In Scotland there is a fourth Presbyterian Church, called the *Relief Church*, so denominated from their having *relieved* themselves from the *patronage* by which livings are conferred in the established church: and, last, though not least of all, the *Reformed Presbyterian Church*, commonly called COVENANTERS, who boast that they alone maintain the genuine *Presbyterian* principles, and are the *purest church* on the face of the earth.

Perhaps these divisions among Presbyterians are merely *local*, and arise from some peculiar circumstances in *Scotland*, which do not operate in America. But nearly the same divisions are found among Presbyterians in this country as subsist in Scotland. In this country there are the *Presbyterian Church*, corresponding to the established Church of Scotland; the Presbyterian *Associate Church*, connected with the Presbyterian *Anti-Burgher* Church of

* EDWARDS, a Presbyterian divine, gives an account of these sects in his *Gangræna*.

Scotland, and which claims at least the merit of consistency in adhering strictly to the original principles of the Secession; the Presbyterian *Associate-Reformed Church*,* maintaining ecclesiastical correspondence with the *Burgher* Church of Scotland; and the *Reformed Presbyterian Church*, corresponding to the church of the same name in Scotland and Ireland.† There are also several Presbyterian

* This church, of which you, sir, are a minister, sprung up in this country about thirty years ago, by the union of some of the ministers and congregations of the *Associate* and *Reformed churches*.

† Of this church, (whose members are commonly called COVEANTERS, it is presumed from their adhering literally to "the solemn league and COVENANT" by which Papacy and Prelacy were solemnly abjured in Scotland) Mr. M'LEOD is a distinguished minister and advocate. They profess to maintain, in greater purity than other sects, the Calvinistic doctrines, and the divinely instituted form of Presbyterian regimen. And they hold the singular opinion, on the subject of civil government, that only "*Christian* rulers, appointed to office according to a *righteous* civil constitution, have authority from God to rule in subserviency to the kingdom of Christ, and are to be conscientiously supported."* They solemnly declare in their standards, that "Presbyterian COVENANTERS perceiving *immorality interwoven with the general and states'* constitution of government in America, have uniformly dissented from the civil establishments."† Again: "There are moral evils essential to the constitution of the United States, which render it necessary to *refuse allegiance to the whole system*. This constitution is, notwithstanding its numerous excellences, in many instances inconsistent, oppressive and *impious*."‡ Persons who hold these sentiments, "if inconsistent with themselves doctrinally, would be justified in rebelling against every government on the face of the earth. In fact, in this country they go so far in what I have not the least doubt is a *conscientious* profession of these principles, as uniformly "to refuse to serve in any office which implies an *approbation of the constitution*—to abstain from giving their votes at elections for legislators or officers who must be qualified to act by an oath of allegiance to this *immoral system*. They cannot consistently swear allegiance to that government in the constitution of which there is so much *immorality*."§ They are "absolutely prohibited from serving on juries," and even from taking an oath in a court of justice, unless "the men in power" will admit that "this oath is performed voluntarily to the Supreme

* Reformation Principles, Part ii. p. 106. † Part i. p. 134.
‡ p. 136. § p. 137.

congregations in East-Jersey and New-York, associated under a Presbytery called the *Morris Presbytery*, and who are independent of the authority of the Presbyterian Church; as also are the numerous churches in *New-England*, who, though Congregational in their form of government, are at present *Presbyterian* in their mode of *ordination*. Here now are several denominations of *Presbyterians*, professing subjection to distinct ecclesiastical judicatories, and some of them refusing church fellowship with the others! When the *Secession* took place in Scotland, the Seceders were solemnly excommunicated by the Established Church; and when the Seceders split into the two sects of *Burghers* and *Anti-*

Being, and by no means a recognition of the magistrate's authority!"* It is but justice, however, to observe, that, "for the sake of peace and good order—from a spirit of resignation to the divine providence, and in order to make legitimate provision for themselves or their relations," they acknowledge that "*so much conformity* to the prevailing system as is consistent with the oath of their allegiance to the Messiah, is a duty conscientiously to be practised, although *very distinct* from that obedience for *conscience sake* which they would render to the government of their choice, to the authority which has the sanction of the divine approbation."†

I mention all these particulars not for your information, sir, but for the sake of "unlearned" readers. And I am sorry to be compelled to observe, that a more unjust philippic against the civil governments, against all denominations of Christians, and particularly against Episcopalians, never came from the pen of an ignorant religious zealot in the most ignorant times, than that drawn up, it is presumed, by Mr. M'Leod, a scholar and a gentleman, and a Christian clergyman "in the beginning of the nineteenth century," and published by the Presbytery of his church under the sacred title of an *Historical View*. The attacks made in that work, and in his Ecclesiastical Catechism, on the Episcopal Church in this country, and on the venerable Church of England, extolled by the Reformers as the bulwark of the Reformation, and now "standing between the dead and the living," and, through the grace of God, "staying the plague" of infidelity which threatened to sweep the earth, warrant and invite an unrestrained examination of his own principles.

* Reformation Principles, Part ii. p. 135, 136

† Mr. M'Leod's sermon, entitled, "Messiah, Governor of the Nations of the Earth," p. 43.

*Burghers*, they excommunicated each other. In like manner, when, in this country, some of the ministers of the *Associate Presbytery*, consisting chiefly of Anti-Burghers, seceded from that Presbytery, and, in conjunction with some of the ministers of the *Reformed Presbytery*, formed a new church under the denomination of the *Associate-Reformed Church* (of which you are a minister,) sentences of excommunication were formerly passed. The ministers of the Reformed Presbytery who joined (what for the sake of conciseness I may be suffered to call) *your* church, were considered by those whom they left, by Mr. M'Leod and his brethren, as "guilty of apostacy;"* as having "under pretence of repairing a breach which they had no hand in making, in spite of their profession and their vows, made a *new schism* by their own voluntary act."† And your church is accused by Mr. M'Leod and his brethren with having "*forsaken the secession testimony* in very important principles." Of the constitution of the very respectable body commonly called the "Presbyterian Church" in this country, Mr. M'Leod and his brethren thus speak: "In this constitution were laid those seeds of *discordant principles* and *general debility* which have since characterized the *Presbyterian Church* in this country, under the direction of a *General Assembly*."‡ Alas, Sir, the *Associate Church*, your own church called the *Associate-Reformed Church*, Mr. M'Leod's church styled the *Reformed Presbyterian* Church or *Covenanters*, though all good Presbyterians, do not hold fellowship with one another in "sealing ordinances," nor with the *Presbyterian Church* commonly so called. Far be it from me to dispute your *right* of dissent. God forbid that it should be wrested from you, or that I should doubt your being conscientious in the exercise of it. But let me ask, am I to find in these schisms proof that Presbyterian government preserves church unity?

* Reformation Principles, Part i. p. 119.
† Reformation Principles, Part i. p. 119.
‡ Reformation Principles, Part i. p. 103.

Or do they afford evidence that this "ecclesiastical government combines the *visible unity* of the church Catholic with *perfect equality of rank* among her ministers?"*

Are such divisions to be found among Episcopalians? Is this detested "Prelacy" the parent of such endless schisms? When any Episcopal Presbyters are desirous to erect a new communion, they cease to be Episcopalians when they become schismatics, and unless they can get a Bishop to head their schism, necessarily have recourse to Presbyterian ordination. With Episcopal schismatics, the difficulty will be to perpetuate the Episcopal succession. I do not pretend that Episcopacy is an infallible security against schism; that it would be impracticable for schismatic Episcopal Presbyters to procure a Bishop and to devise means of perpetuating the Episcopal succession. But I contend that there would be greater obstacles in their way than under the Presbyterian regimen. For when three or four Presbyterian ministers deem it proper to establish a new church, they have only to constitute themselves a Presbytery, and they instantly become as good Presbyterians as those they leave, perhaps even more pure, more refined, more zealous. Candidly, Sir, I am at a loss to see in what way Presbyterian government tends to preserve "the visible unity of the church Catholic;" and why, on the contrary, it is not perfectly compatible "with rending the body of Christ at pleasure," with schisms and divisions without end.†

Episcopacy then, as the instituted mode by which the ministerial commission is conveyed from the great Head of the church, and as the bond of Christian unity, claims the obedience of all Christians. Considered as a *form of government*, it has at least equal claims with Presbytery. The essentials

* Christian's Magazine, Introduction, p. 12, 13.

† After this view of *Presbyterian unity*, we must surely be amused to hear Mr. M'Leod seriously declaring that "the universal prevalence of real *Presbyterianism* can alone render Jerusalem a QUIET *habitation*."*

* Ecclesiastical Catechism, p. 129.

of Episcopacy being only the preservation of the three grades of the ministry with their appropriate powers, it admits in the structure of its government of such modifications as may adapt it to the different circumstances of the church, and to the varying forms of civil policy. The insinuation sometimes made, that there is a peculiar connection between *Episcopacy* and *monarchy*, is as false as its design is uncandid and ungenerous. In Great-Britain, Episcopacy and Presbytery are both established by law in different parts of the nation; and I never heard that the *Presbyterians* of *Scotland* were less loyal than the *Episcopalians* of England.

In this country there is a striking resemblance between the structure of Episcopal government and that of the civil polity. In every diocese the *Bishop* presiding over it corresponds to the *Governor* or supreme executive officer of each state. Though he receives his Episcopal commission from the Bishops who ordained him, he is elected by the clergy and laity, who thus possess the security that no person shall be exalted over them as Bishop who is obnoxious to them. In the discharge of his executive functions, and in the administration of discipline, the Presbyters are considered as his *Council;* corresponding to the *Councils* in some of the states, or to the *Senate* in the general government, who are associated with the chief magistrate in the exercise of the executive authority. Though he alone confers the ministerial commission, yet he can ordain no one who has not been previously approved and recommended by some of the clergy and laity. The convention, (consisting of the clergy and delegates from each congregation) in which the Bishop presides, and in which the local concerns of each diocese are regulated, answers to the legislative body of each state. The general convention, or supreme ecclesiastical authority of the church, has been organized upon that judicious principle of *dividing power*, and placing it in different *houses*, upon which the civil constitutions are founded. In this convention there are two houses, the Bishops composing one, and the clerical

and lay deputies the other; answering to the two houses in the civil legislatures. And the Bishops, and the clerical and lay deputies have a reciprocal check upon each other in the enacting of laws. Thus, the power of making laws in the Episcopal Church in America, is regulated by that sound principle of ecclesiastical polity laid down by the judicious HOOKER—"In *matters of God*—it were unnatural not to think the *Pastors* and *Bishops* of our souls a great deal *more fit* than men of secular trades and callings: howbeit, when all which the *wisdom of all sorts* can do, is done for the devising laws in the church, it is the *general consent of all* that giveth them the *form* and *vigour* of laws."*

* This passage of HOOKER is quoted at p. 128 of these letters. The same principle is thus stated by a Bishop who has always taken a leading part in the concerns of the American Episcopal Church.* "Reason and propriety require that those persons are to have a pre-eminence in the business" of regulating ecclesiastical affairs, "whose stations in the church invest them with the greatest share of responsibility"—for to the Bishops and clergy "the oversight of the flock" is committed by authority transmitted from the divine Head of the church, and to him they are to "give an account of their stewardship." "But yet (as the Bishop goes on to observe) the more fully the things determined carry with them the sanction of *all the orders* to be governed by them," the laity as well as the Bishops and clergy, "the nearer they conform to the true principles of legislation, whether it be ecclesiastical or civil; and the more likely they are to be wisely done, and to be peaceably and profitably executed. In all this, however, there is room for considerable variety, according as human prudence shall direct." Obvious and indispensable is the principle which the Bishop further states: "Regulations thus made, are *binding on persons of all orders in the church;* and on the contrary supposition, there can be no order or social government, but every one is left to his own humour or opinion."

Order, social government, Christian unity so sacredly enjoined by Christ and his Apostles, would be subverted, if any individual or inferior judicatory of the church were at liberty to resist the acts of the supreme ecclesiastical authority. Dissensions and schisms without number would rend and subvert the church. The injunction of Christ is express, that we are to *hear the church* in all things not contrary to the law of God.

* Bishop WHITE, in a Consecration Sermon preached before the General Convention, 1804.

Mr. M'Leod is pleased to observe, that the general convention of the Episcopal Church is a mere "human contrivance."* What! is it a human invention that the Bishops and clergy, who are the divinely commissioned governors of the church, should meet to legislate for it? But it seems "they share their *power* with *unauthorized laymen*."† And what power do they thus share? Not the ministry of the *word* and *sacraments;* for these none can exercise but they

"If any man refuse to *hear the church*, let him be unto you as a heathenman and a publican." The command too is explicit, "*obey them* that have the *rule over* you, and submit yourselves: for they *watch for your souls*, as they that must give account:"* and the sentence of the *council* at Jerusalem† was definitive and binding on all the churches. The exercise of the supreme authority in the Episcopal Church is carefully guarded from abuse. The concurrence of the three orders being necessary to any act of the general convention, no one order can encroach upon the other. The clergy and laity are represented by their delegates: and the Bishops are not only liable to impeachment, but hold stations of such great responsibility, and so conspicuous in the church, that there is no danger of their erring through excess of authority. Abuses of Episcopal prerogative took place either in the ages of darkness or superstition, or when the Bishops were independent, and armed with secular authority "Power becomes dangerous, not from the *precedency* of one man, but from his being independent. Had Rome been governed by a Presbytery instead of a Bishop; and had that Presbytery been invested with the independent riches of the Papal See; it is easy to conceive of their acquiring as much power over the Christian world as was ever known in a Gregory or a Paul."

The only case "in which *private conscience* and not *public law* becomes the rule of conduct," is when the ecclesiastical authority attempts to "*change* the revealed will of God." When any ecclesiastical acts are deemed unjust or impolitic, common sense and propriety obviously suggest the obtaining, by remonstrance or by the exercise of those numerous *checks* possessed by the church at large, of a change in those obnoxious measures, rather than by *resistance* to violate the first principles of order and government, and church unity, and thus throw the church into disorder and endanger her existence.

The above principles are essential to the preservation of al. government; of Presbyterian as well as Episcopal.

* Ecclesiastical Catechism, p. 129. † Ibid

* Heb. xiii. 17. † Acts xv.

who are "called of God, as was Aaron." Not the power of *ordination;* for this is necessarily *exclusive*, and must flow "to the end of the world," in the channel in which it was at first placed. While *this power* and the *ministry of the word and sacraments* are preserved *inviolate*, every thing else in the constitution of the church is a matter of *human regulation* and *expediency*. There is nothing in scripture forbidding the associating of the *laity* with the *clergy* in making ecclesiastical *laws*. It is a principle of sound legislation, sanctioned by reason and good policy, to obtain, as far as may be practicable and consistent with the order and strength of government, the consent of all those to the laws who are to be governed by them. The requiring of *every thing* in the church's government to be of *divine institution*, is an error of *puritanism*. It never has been, and it never can be carried completely into effect. In the church many things must be regulated by the dictates of reason and common sense, and by the principles of sound policy. This error of puritanism is admirably exposed by HOOKER, in his Ecclesiastical Polity. Let Mr. M'LEOD take up HOOKER and answer him. He will do what has never yet been done, and will gain infinitely more honour than by torturing texts of scripture to support principles most remote from their obvious meaning.

The superintending influence and authority of the BISHOP, increased as it generally is by age and experience, will tend to give *unity* of design and *promptness* of execution to ecclesiastical measures. By his *charges* and admonitions to his clergy, he may successfully excite them to prudent animation and firmness in defending the holy faith and authority of the church; to tender faithfulness and zeal in proclaiming the truths of salvation; and to diligence and perseverance in the discharge of all their sacred functions. By his instructions, his counsels, his affectionate sympathy, he may direct, inspirit and console them under the pressure of the difficulties and trials to which they are exposed. By his frequent and faithful administration of the rite of *confirmation*, he may

impress on the young the awful importance of their spiritual interests, place them under the guidance of divine grace, and lead them in that knowledge which will make them wise unto salvation. By his *visitations* to his churches, by his *pastoral letters* and admonitions, he may contribute to arrest the baneful spirit of infidelity, and the insidious advances of heretical opinions, to prevent and heal divisions and schisms, to strengthen the ties of harmony, to excite and promote primitive piety, lively and sober zeal for the interests of the kingdom of the Redeemer.

But, Sir, you have found out a compendious way of demolishing all the arguments in favour of Episcopacy and the Episcopal Church. Her members are corrupt—her clergy are unfaithful—in regard to *practical religion*, and what you deem the essentials of a church of Christ, she is not worthy to be compared with the non-Episcopal churches. The following very modest challenge decorates the pages of the Christian's Magazine.

"For assuredly, if there is not within this church much more of 'power and love, and of a sound mind;' much more of the fear of God; of 'receiving Christ Jesus the Lord' and 'walking in him;' of *reverential* attendance upon his worship; of domestic and personal godliness; in one word, much more of the spiritual life, and of that holiness without which no man shall see the Lord; if much more of these things be not found *within* his church than *without* it, 'what doth it profit?' Will Mr. H. meet the ordeal? Will he accompany us from temple to temple, from pulpit to pulpit, from house to house, from closet to closet, and agree, that in proportion as there is little or much of 'pure and undefiled religion' in them, their grade in the Christian churches shall be low or high? Is it, then, a fact, that in the church which boasts of the only valid ministrations, and the exclusive prerogative of being in covenant with God, there is more evangelical preaching; more of Christ crucified; more plain, close, decisive dealing with the consciences of men, upon the things which belong

to their peace, than in many of the churches which she affects to despise? Is it a fact, that her 'authorized priesthood' are more scrupulous about the preservation of pure communion; that they object more strongly to the admission of mere men of the world; and are more active in excluding from their fellowship the openly irreligious, than are others? Is it a fact, that they adopt more prompt and vigorous measures to expel from their pulpits doctrine which flies in the face of their avowed principles, and is acknowledged by themselves to be subversive of the Christian system? Is it a fact, that in this 'primitive apostolic' church, the sheep of Christ and his lambs are more plentifully fed with 'the bread of God which came down from heaven?' Or that she has less to attract the thoughtless gay, and more to allure those who become seriously concerned about their eternal salvation, than is to be found in hundreds of churches which she virtually delivers unto Satan? Are these facts? We appeal to them who have eyes to see and ears to hear; especially to them who 'have tasted that the Lord is gracious."

Now, sir, had I taken up one of the musty chronicles of the "true church militant" of the seventeenth century, when "godly zeal for reformation"

> " —Made all cries about the town
> Join throats to cry the Bishops down"—

and found in it this violent declamation against the Episcopal Church, this display of superior holiness and zeal, it would have occasioned me no surprise. I should instantly have ascribed it to some fiery religious zealot, some

> " —Fierce inquisitor who has chief
> Dominion over men's belief
> And manners; can pronounce a saint
> Idolatrous or ignorant,
> When superciliously he sifts
> Through coarsest boulter others' gifts;
> For all men live and judge amiss
> Whose talents jump not just with his."

But I can scarcely believe that I have found it in the

*Christian's Magazine*, and that it comes from the pen of Dr. MASON.

And yet, Sir, I might have expected all this, and more. Your precursor, Mr. M'LEOD, had spoken of the Episcopal Church in his Ecclesiastical Catechism," in a style and spirit that ought to have prevented my being surprised at any thing that came from the same quarter. What admirable specimens of humility and Christian candour are the following! The highest commendation I can pass upon them is, that they will not yield the palm to the foregoing extract from the Christian's Magazine.

"Those who do not 'like to retain God in their knowledge,' are given over to 'strong delusions.' Such also as *invent* forms of worship, not satisfied with the simplicity of the scripture modes, are often, by the judgment of a just God, given over to their own idols."* Mark this Episcopalians. You have *invented a form of worship*, and the *judgment of a just God has given you over to your own idols;* that is, you know "little of" the true God or his worship! Is there any doubt that this is Mr. M'LEOD's meaning? Read what he immediately subjoins to the foregoing: "Let any man of piety consider the state of religion in the *Popish* and *Episcopal* Churches—Let a man of spiritual discernment inquire into the state of *vital godliness* in them, and he will find that *little of it is left. They groan under a load of superstition which has been accumulating for ages.* Let *their* experience warn others to abstain from every act of will worship."†

Again: "As the spirit of prayer departs from men the practice of prayer will be relinquished, or *mere forms* adopted."‡ So then, we cannot have the *spirit of prayer* when we use the prayer indited by our blessed Lord himself, and which to us is a *mere form.* "The superstition of Rome, and the tyranny of Henry the Eighth is the true foundation of the *Episcopal Liturgy.*"§ What! is Mr. M'L. ignorant that

* Ecclesiastical Catechism by Mr. M'LEOD, p. 125. † p. 125. ‡ p. 126.
§ Ecclesiastical Catechism, by Mr. M'LEOD, p. 126.

many parts of the Liturgy are taken from the liturgies of the primitive church; that the whole of it was compiled by venerable Reformers, who consecrated it with their blood; and that it has since been improved by men whose fame for piety will ever be in the churches?—"Obliged to conform to this measure, attempts have been made to justify it. Arguments which at first tended to palliate an evil which the Bishops had not power to remedy, are at last thought sufficient to establish a divine right. Such are the gradations of HUMAN FOLLY."* Thank you, Mr. M'LEOD. Long may Episcopalians glory in that FOLLY which prizes the Liturgy as the finest, purest, and most elevated strain of devotion that ever fell from uninspired lips. Recollect, the gospel itself was "foolishness" to the self-righteous Pharisee, and to the "vain disputer," puffed up with false *philosophy*.

Mark again: "Preaching is the meanest service in the *Popish* and *Episcopal* Churches. It is merely subservient to the government of Bishops and Popes. The Bishops exalt the mean above the end. *Government* is with them the principal part of religion. To be in power is more dignified than to edify."† "The Evangelists have been transformed into prelates by the Churches of Rome and England. These churches can canonize Saints and consecrate Bishops at pleasure. It is remarkable that they are always for increasing the power, but never for appreciating the labour of the teacher."‡ What! does Mr. M'L. mean to advance *preaching* above the duties of prayer and praise? Let him profit by the very just admonition of the "Presbyterian Church." She declares, "As one primary design of public ordinances is to pay social acts of homage to the Most High God, ministers ought to be careful not to make their sermons so long as to interfere with, or exclude the *more important duties of prayer and praise*."§ Would to God that this principle of regarding "prayer and praise as the more *important duties*," was impressed on the heart of every

* Ecclesiastical Catechism by Mr. M'LEOD, p. 126. † p. 106 ‡ p. 107.
§ Directory for Worship, chap. vi. sect. 4.

Christian. The prevailing rage to make religion consist in *hearing sermons*, and in running "from Dan to Beersheba" after *popular preachers*, threatens serious injury to the interests of enlightened and substantial piety and devotion. This is the more inexcusable in Episcopalians, because they possess a service in which they may always worship God in spirit and in truth. Whatever may be the defects of the *preacher*, they can find in the liturgy the "bread of life" to nourish, and to comfort the soul.* Just are the remarks, that "Christians are united to God by being brought into covenant with him by baptism; and are united to one another by being members of his church. This union, which has been cemented by the blood of Christ, is to be preserved by the ordinances of the church; and consequently *joint prayers*, or social worship and *communion in the sacraments*, are as necessary to eternal life as hearing the word of God *preached:* and, it may be added, much more so than hearing the word of God preached without them."

But, do the Episcopal Churches account "preaching a *mean* service," or "make government the principal part of religion?" Is not *preaching* a part of the public service not merely on the Lord's day, but on all the greater festivals and fasts consecrated to the commemoration of the leading events in the history of Christ, and of the great truths of Redemption? Are not the principal churches in England opened *daily*, and in this country several times a week, for the purpose of offering prayer and praises to God, and hearing his holy word? Does all this look as if they did not "appreciate the *labour* of the teacher"—as if to "edify" were a subordinate object in Episcopal Churches; unless indeed Mr. M'L. supposes that "prayer and praise, and hearing the

* Thus observes the celebrated Calvinistic divine, TOPLADY, "Let a parish minister be ever so spiritually blind and dead, the *liturgy remains the same.* Blessed be God, the clergy are forced to read it, and to administer the Lord's supper and other offices according to its *admirable and animating form of sound words.*" Toplady's Works, vol. vi. p. 295.

word of God," do not tend to "edify" when not connected with *preaching*? Does not Mr. M'L. know that the sermons of English Bishops that have been published compose numerous volumes; and that the sermons of Bishop ANDREWS, Bishop SANDERSON, Bishop TAYLOR, Bishop BULL, Bishop BEVERIDGE, and in later times of the Bishops SECKER, WILSON, HORNE, HURD, and PORTEUS, and "a legion more," will bear a comparison with any sermons extant, for depth of erudition, critical research, just and impressive elucidation of divine truth, apostolic simplicity, and pious fervour? Exempted as some of the English Bishops are from the duty of *constant parochial* preaching, the sermons that they have published are proofs that, though on them lies "the care of the churches," they have not neglected this duty. And when we also consider that some of the most profound and able works in defence of Christianity and its doctrines have come from the bench of English Bishops, we shall be able to appreciate the *justice* of the charge, that with Bishops, "to be in *power* is more dignified than to *edify*." When Mr. M'L. talks of the *power* of Bishops, let him try to recollect whether there are not historical facts which prove that "the *little finger* of *Presbytery* can be thicker than the *loins* of *Prelacy*."

"Bishops and Popes"—"Popish and Episcopal Churches"—These are the ungenerous arts constantly used to excite vulgar prejudices against Episcopal Churches, that have been the most determined opponents of the corruptions of the Church of Rome.

Further still: "The *convocations* and *conventions* of the Episcopalians are no more than very *disorderly Presbyterian Synods*."* Sorry, very sorry that Episcopalians have got into bad company, and have had their good manners corrupted by evil examples. Again: "The boast of Episcopacy—the number of her sons—is proof of her own connection with Antichrist—all the world wondered after the

* Ecclesiastical Catechism, p. 129.

beast."* So then, when all the nations of the earth become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, the reign of Antichrist will be at its height! Really, sir, you ought not to thank Mr. M'L. for this remark; for, according to it, Presbyterians in this country, as they are the most *numerous*, are connecting themselves with Antichrist, beginning to court the "mystical Babylon," and to "be drunk with the cup of her abominations." But here comes the climax of this highly wrought description of Episcopal corruption. "Some Episcopalians consider baptism as synonymous with regeneration. This is more absurd than the Anabaptist conceit. There are, however, *masters in Israel who know as little about the* NEW BIRTH *as Nicodemus did.*"†

Episcopalians! all this is from the pen of persons who apply to themselves the exclusive title of evangelical, and brand you and your ministers with having "little of vital godliness!" And yet we are to be silent, hear our venerable church and her apostolic worship abused, our title even to the "power of godliness" questioned, without defending ourselves—for *fear of giving offence!* And do the opponents of the church act on this principle? No, I commend them for a more *manly* policy, for a determined resistance to what they deem error and corruption, unawed by any "human regards."

"*Masters in Israel,*" says Mr. M'LEOD, "*who know as little about the new birth as Nicodemus did.*" Here, Episcopalians, allusion is particularly made to one of your Bishops, who has ably vindicated the doctrine of *baptismal regeneration.* "Who art thou, O man, that thus judgest another?" Who gave thee the right and power to sit in judgment on the heart, and to pronounce a venerable Clergyman, and an exemplary Christian, a stranger to that "new birth," without which no man can enter the kingdom of God?

That the Bishop of the Episcopal Church in New-York was here particularly aimed at, is evident from the circum-

* Ecclesiastical Catechism, p. 129. † p. 127.

stance that he published a defence of baptismal regeneration. and Mr. M'L. a few sentences after the one above quoted, observes concerning this doctrine, "Miserable Episcopalians! if this be all your regeneration! But I reject the ungenerous, the infamous thought. No, I would not believe it on the authority of *one of your own Bishops.*" Grant, however, that there is no particular allusion. So much the worse. For then all the Episcopal clergy who believe this doctrine of their church are involved in this charge. "There are *masters in Israel* who know as little about the *new birth* as Nicodemus did!"

The opponents of the doctrine of *baptismal regeneration* either do not, or will not know that there is a distinction made in the language of the Episcopal Church as well as of scripture, between REGENERATION and RENOVATION. "He saved us," saith the Apostle,* "by the *washing of regeneration*, and the *renewing of the Holy Ghost*"—the former expression evidently denoting *baptism.* The same distinction is observed by the church in her baptismal service, and particularly in one of her Collects.† "Grant that we, being *regenerate*, may daily be *renewed* by thy Holy Spirit." Episcopalians maintain *baptismal regeneration* in this sense, that the *baptized* person is *born again*, not in the affections of his soul, but into a *new state*, in which he receives conditionally a title to the blessings of the gospel covenant. But do Episcopalians, therefore, deny the necessity of the "renewing of the mind?" God forbid! No; they maintain, that unless in the baptized person, by the power of that Holy Spirit a title to which is conferred in baptism, the "old man be buried and the new man raised up;" unless "all sinful affections die in him, and all things belonging to the *Spirit* do live and grow in him;" unless the "old man be crucified, and the whole body of sin abolished;" unless he "*die* from sin, and *rise* again unto righteousness,"‡ unless he thus be "*renewed* by the Holy Ghost," his baptismal *regeneration* will only

* Titus iii. 5. † For Christmas day. ‡ Baptismal Service.

aggravate his guilt and increase his condemnation. The advocate of baptismal regeneration may, therefore, consistently maintain the necessity of the *new birth* in its strongest spiritual sense.

To vindicate the institutions of the Episcopal Church from all these charges, I might appeal to the testimony of the divines of the Reformed churches, some of whom I have already adduced. I might urge a long list of Calvinistic divines of the Church of England, the "HERVEYS, the ROMAINES, the NEWTONS, the SCOTTS," all of whom gloried in their being sons of that church which Mr. M'L. says is "connected with ANTICHRIST," and "groans under a load of superstition;" all of whom offered up the devotions of the congregation in those "*mere forms*" which Mr. M'L. says are only "adopted" "as the spirit of prayer departs from men."

The celebrated TOPLADY, who stands high in the estimation of Calvinists, forbids any person's forsaking the Church of England (as reasonably he might) through "love for the gospel of grace." "It should rather bind him more closely and firmly to a church whose doctrines and sacraments are holy, harmless, undefiled; and alike remote from error, *superstition*, and licentiousness."* In consistency with this principle, TOPLADY "constantly and strictly *communicated in the church only*," (and he enjoins the same conduct on others) even though "the clergymen from whom he received the memorials of Christ's dying love knew no more of the gospel" (strange assertion for a *humble Christian*) "than so many stocks or stones."†

I take some pride, however, in a testimony in favour of the Church of England from a different quarter, from one whose panegyric is thus drawn by a periodical writer, who, I am told, stands high in your esteem. "As a poet, a scholar, as one endowed with wit and genius, a philosopher, and a good moral man" (and the public voice will add also,

* Toplady's Works, vol. vi. p. 294. † Ibid. vol. vi. p 295.

as a good Christian) "neither Britain nor any other country can boast of such a bright example as Dr. BEATTIE." The following is from the pen of his biographer: "Although Dr. BEATTIE had been brought up a member of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and regularly attended her worship and ordinances when at Aberdeen, he yet gave the most decided preference to the Church of England, generally attending the service of that church when any where from home, and constantly when at Peterhead. He spoke with enthusiasm of the *beauty*, *simplicity*, and *energy* of the English Liturgy, especially of the *litany*, which he declared to be the finest piece of uninspired composition in any language."* This celebrated philosopher and amiable man entertained the same opinion of the Church of England with a distinguished prelate, (Dr. DRUMMOND, Archbishop of York) who was his friend and correspondent. "The Church of England is the most agreeable to Christian discipline; equally distant from wild conceit and implicit faith; free, manly, and benevolent; conducive to the cause of truth and virtue, to the happiness of society, and of every individual in it. And it is the establishment that seems to carry the fairest aspect with it towards promoting pure Christianity and civil order, without *overbearing*, or *artful*, or *abject* means."† Great as may be my respect for the talents and piety of Dr. M. and Mr. M'L. I certainly should not be disposed, as far as *opinion* goes, to rely more on theirs than on that of Dr. DRUMMOND and Dr. BEATTIE.

But, sir, it seems the Episcopal Church is deficient in "vital godliness," and in "pure and undefiled religion." You will not find me the apologist of the lukewarmness or defects of Christians because they are of my "own house-

* Life of Beattie, by Sir William Forbes, American edition, p. 4, 98. There are some reviewers and writers who affect to depreciate Dr. Beattie and his biographer. The cause of this is apparent: Dr. Beattie gave "a decided preference to the Church of England."

† Life of Beattie, p. 165, American edition.

hold." In common with my clerical brethren, it is a source of bitter regret to me, and the painful subject on which I trust we often pour out our hearts before the Father of mercies, that an inordinate attachment to the world and its pleasures seems to have eaten up the piety and zeal of too many who call themselves Churchmen. And perhaps, sir, we are not disposed to boast that we are entirely "guiltless in this matter;" or that our zeal, faithfulness and diligence in inculcating those DOCTRINES OF THE CROSS which have ever proved the "power of God unto salvation," could not have been greater. "Our trust, O Lord, is not in our own merits, but in thy manifold and great mercies."

But you surely are sensible that *spiritual pride*, *arrogance*, and *censoriousness*, are vices as hateful in the sight of God, and as inconsistent with the "power of godliness" and the Christian temper, as are indifference, lukewarmness and attachment to worldly pleasure. You surely are sufficiently acquainted with human nature to know, that spiritual pride, arrogance, and censoriousness often exist in those who are loudest in their calls for *evangelical preaching*, and who have "the Lord Jesus" most frequently on their lips.* It is much more easy and pleasant with bold faith to call the Redeemer *Lord*, *Lord*, and to listen to *glowing* descriptions of his GRACE (and if they be sober, I am far from insinuating that they can be too glowing) than it is faithfully and constantly to apply this grace to "crucifying the flesh" with its evil tempers, to bringing down the "*high* and *lofty* imaginations" of the heart. The Christian, like his divine master, is *meek* and *lowly*, not merely in *profession*. Alas! professions are easily supported by those cant phrases that are often transmitted from one religionist to another, and

* The perversity of human nature, and the deceitfulness of the human heart, are in nothing more apparent than in the disposition of men to make a commutation of vices.

"Compound for sins they are inclined to,
By damning those they have no mind to."

repeated by rote, as the school-boy would con over his lesson. But the Christian is "meek and lowly in *heart;*" in a life uniformly gentle, in a deportment habitually unassuming, kind, humble and peaceable. "Meekness, gentleness, and humility" are among the principal "fruits of the spirit." And perhaps if you take these as the standard of the "power of godliness," you may be induced to abate somewhat of your censures of Episcopalians, and somewhat of your high commendations of those whom you triumphantly contrast with them. Far be it from me proudly to seat myself in the throne of judgment, and to wield the bolts of censure. Many, it gratifies me to say, very many are there among non-Episcopal Christians, who, by their meek, their humble, and holy virtues, evidence that they "have been with Jesus," and are "taught by his spirit." But sure I am, sir, that in the "Right Rev. Prelates,"* to whom I am sorry to say you allude in your wonted contemptuous manner, there appear the graces of humility, meekness, and unaffected piety, shining with a lustre that would not have disgraced the apostolic age, and which, really sir, it will be happy for us both if we can display. But I dismiss an odious comparison, on which I deeply regret you have thought it necessary to enlarge.

But in your triumphant enumeration of the Christian graces of non-Episcopalians, you have forgotten to inquire whether they possess that most important one—*Christian unity*, "the keeping of the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." Whether this unity be compatible with those divisions which, since their departure from Episcopacy, they are multiplying without end, is surely worthy of their serious consideration.†

In my judgment the comparison was unnecessary and

* Bishop MOORE of New-York, and Bishop WHITE of Pennsylvania.

† The Roman Catholics reproach the Protestant Episcopal Churches with a breach of Christian unity. The answer is at hand—The Church of Rome prescribes *sinful terms of communion.* This plea for separation from Protestant Episcopal Churches cannot be urged.

irrelevant. The defects and corruptions in the Episcopal Church, were they as great as you represent them, do not arise from her doctrines or institutions, both of which are pure and spiritual, and calculated to nurse men for the church triumphant in heaven. By what rule of justice are doctrines or institutions to be made accountable for the misconduct of those who *neglect* or *pervert* them? Was not the Jewish Church of divine origin? And yet there was a time when there were only "seven thousand" among the people of God "who had not bowed the knee to Baal." Your reasoning would justify us in considering the idolatry and corruptions of the Jews as proofs that the Church of God was not among them, that "the statutes and ordinances of the Most High" were unnecessary, because they were ineffectual. Causes, for which neither her doctrines nor institutions are accountable, there have been, in abundance, to produce whatever laxity or faults may be discoverable in the American Episcopal Church. For a long, long period she was a depressed church. Destitute of Bishops, which those in power, listening to the representations of her opponents, refused to allow her to enjoy, the orders of her ministry were incomplete, and her "candidates were forced to seek for ordination in another hemisphere, at a great expense; which many of them were but ill able to bear. From the same defect she was without union, without government. But her unhappy situation in this respect was, by the late revolutionary war, much aggravated. Many of her clergy were attached on principle to the church and monarchy of Britain; and not caring to concur in the measures which were taking to effect a separation from her, abandoned their cures, and returned for refuge to what had till then been termed the mother country. Death removed others. Great numbers of parishes became vacant; and the service of the church therein utterly suspended." Even the smiles of the civil power in the Southern States proved the bane of the church. The civil authority "secured to the clergy their salaries during life,

independently of *good behaviour*." There were no Bishops to advise, to admonish the clergy, or to exercise discipline over them. The dangers and difficulties attending the obtaining of a foreign ordination discouraged natives from entering into the ministry. And thus the independent salaries of the clergy were only a lure to foreign clergymen, who, with some *honourable exceptions*, were generally adventurers destitute of talents, of piety, or of zeal.*

Flourishing as other denominations were under discipline completely organized, the Episcopal Church, at the close of the American war, stripped of some of her best clergy, of numbers of her laity, of the accustomed means of support, without government, without discipline, was left a depressed, and, alas! from various causes, a *divided* church. It is a matter of astonishment and gratitude that she did not sink under the difficulties, the distractions and divisions which assailed her. But she was that "vine which the right hand of the Lord had planted," which he beheld with compassion, and resolved to "visit." Adversity had not extinguished that evangelical liturgy which, like a sacred fire, kindled at the altar of heaven, shed the light of truth amidst the dark night of error, und diffused warmth amidst the chilling damps of lukewarmness. Yes! to this liturgy, under the blessing of God upon the exertions of those who in her adversity did not forsake her, she in a great measure owes her preservation. May the daughter of Zion shake herself from the dust, and shine forth in the garments of "glory and beauty!"

Your arguments against the Episcopal Church from the supposed defects of her ministers and members, are founded on a principle contrary to daily, universal, and uniform experience, that the *profession of truth* is *always* connected with corresponding *fruits of holiness and virtue*. This principle furnishes the infidel with a weapon with which, at one blow, he

* The above statement is taken in substance from an ordination sermon preached by the Rev. Dr. ANDREWS, of Philadelphia, whom I revere as one of my earliest and most affectionate guides and preceptors.

may demolish the Christian system. He has only to prove that the lives of many Christian professors are disgraced by numerous follies and vices; and, according to your reasoning, it follows, that the system of Christianity cannot be true. A system of divine origin and power would produce in its professors more holy fruits! This reasoning overlooks the obvious and universally admitted distinction between a *cause* and its *advocates*, between *principles* and the *conduct* of those who profess them, between the *theory* and *institutions* of a church and the *practice* of its members. To contend from the defects and vices of the *latter*, that the pretensions of the *former* are unfounded, outrages common sense and justice; and is a mode of reasoning which, when wielded by the infidel, proves that Christianity itself is founded in error.

Consider the tendency of your reasoning in the mouth of one of the society of Friends or Quakers. Whatever may be the failings of individuals of this sect, yet as a society they certainly exhibit, in no ordinary degree, the fruits of love to God and benevolence to man. And what! may the Quakers exclaim, are all these in the estimation of an arrogant Priest to pass for nothing, and are we to be accused of "laying the axe at the root of entire Christianity," because we "set aside the distinctive character and authentic call of the gospel ministry?"* Can this ministry and the sacraments administered by them be so essential in the Christian church, that the rejection of them "lays the axe at the root of entire Christianity," when we who discard them, evidence among us as much of *pure and undefiled religion*, as they do who connect the ministry and sacraments with the system of "entire Christianity?" Can these sacraments and ministry be indeed of God? Would then he who is the "Author of every good and perfect gift," and "without whom we can do nothing," enable us who reject his institutions, to exhibit any of "the fruits of the spirit." No, says the Quaker, we put these "champions" of a *hireling priesthood* "upon

* Christian's Magazine, Introduction, p. 5.

their trial before the bar of scripture, of conscience, and of public criticism. We demand the evidence of the superiority of their practical religion, both in quantity and quality. If they cannot nor will not answer, no rational man will be at a loss for the reason."* Truly, Sir, I must insist on your settling this important point with the Quaker, before I can allow you to assail Episcopalians with the weapons which he successfully wields against yourself.

Again, Sir: Place your reasoning against Episcopalians in the mouth of the Methodist, or lay preacher. Them you denounce,† not only for "endeavouring to set aside the distinctive character, and the authentic call of the gospel ministry," but for "proscribing from the ministry all talents"—and "for drawing many after their pernicious ways," by addressing themselves to the avarice of one class, to the conceit of another, to the credulity of a third, and to the ignorance of all." What! may the Methodist and *lay preacher* exclaim, does this arrogant "lettered gownsman" pretend that "learning" or an external commission is necessary to "divine teaching?" We put him on "his trial before the bar of scripture, of conscience, and of public criticism." Let him produce the "seals of his ministry;" and let us see whether his *learned* labours have been more blessed to the conversion of souls than have been the labours of hundreds who, destitute of what he considers an "authentic call," destitute of "human learning," have relied only on the *call of the spirit*, on *divine teaching*.

Alas, sir! alas, sir! Your reasoning against the principles of Episcopalians from the deficiency of *vital godliness* among them, is a two-edged sword as destructive to your own cause as to theirs! In the hands of the infidel, the Quaker, and the Methodist, or lay preacher, it may be wielded to prostrate Christianity, to subvert all positive institutions, and to

* This is the language of your boastful challenge to Episcopalians. Christian's Magazine, p. 103.

† Christian's Magazine, p. 4.

cut up by the roots the Christian ministry and the visible church.

Every thing good in man proceeds from the efficacious influence of the Holy Spirit. We shall, therefore, be compelled to acknowledge, that this Holy Spirit, evidenced by some of its fruits, dwells with many who maintain great and fundamental errors; nay, with many who by "endeavouring to set aside the distinctive character and the authentic call of the gospel ministry," "lay their axe at the root of entire Christianity."* Do we, therefore, make void the positive institutions of the Almighty? God forbid! He who "worketh all things according to the counsel of his own will," may dispense with his own institutions, and depart from the settled order of the economy of grace. It may please him to bless the *sincere* and even the *hypocritical* exertions and labours of those who reject the *positive institutions* and laws of his house. "He giveth not to man an account of his doings." The inefficacy of these institutions on the lives of many, and the piety and holiness which others exhibit who reject them, may be trials of our *humility* and *submission;* tests whether under these inauspicious appearances we may not arrogantly exclaim, "To what purpose are these positive ordinances? We may be pious and virtuous without them!" Ah! let not the humble believer be seduced by this specious but arrogant reasoning from the "ways of God's appointment." It was this proud spirit which urged our first parents to violate a *positive institution* of the Almighty; which lost them paradise, and the fallen angels the glory of their "first estate."

* Introduction, p. 5.

## LETTER XV.

SIR,

THE second number of the Christian's Msgazine displays the same arrogant ostentation of superior learning, the same contempt of the talents of the advocates of Episcopacy, the same confident assertion on which the first number relied for success. It seems it was unpardonable arrogance for Mr. H. to assert that the "Author of Miscellanies has with great industry collected together *all* the arguments against Episcopacy." What! to pretend to be acquainted with *all* the arguments "on either side of a question," without having perused the profound and luminous elucidations of the Editor of the Christian's Magazine! Verily—this was a presumption which merited chastisement. Now, sir, I still am disposed to suspect, that you will not have adduced a single argument to which the Author of Miscellanies has not directly or indirectly alluded—so that I shall be justified in saying in a loose and general sense (and really I did not expect the Editor of the Christian's Magazine would condescend to quibbling on words) that he had "collected together all the arguments against Episcopacy." That he has traced them in all their bearings on the subject, and placed them in their most formidable array, I have no where asserted. And yet, sir, at present there is no prospect that your attack will obtain for you greater honours than those which he has merited.

"Mr. H. has taken some pains to invite an examination of his scholarship"*—"We entirely acquit Cyprian of the charge of sinning against knowledge."† Mr. H. the Layman, and Cyprian are the "*unlearned* advocates of the hierarchy."‡ Presumptuous men! luckless was the hour when ye provoked the wrath of the *learned Dr. M.* that paragon of talents, who, glowing with intuitive knowledge,

* Christian's Magazine, No. II. p. 188. † p. 203. ‡ p. 205.

can exhaust any subject without reading a page or consulting an author!

But, sir, (I am almost afraid to expostulate with you lest I should provoke your heavier vengeance) it was not quite *fair*, it was not quite *generous* and *manly* (*modesty* I know is an unfashionable virtue) to overwhelm by your dazzling talents three humble individuals who have reached only the first steps of the temple of science, whose vestibule you have long since passed, whose sacred recesses you have already explored. At our period of life, eight or ten years may make an important difference in the sum of attainments. And, through the good providence of God, we can look forward to at least as many years before we shall equal the present age of our giant censor. When as many suns have rolled over our heads as have shed their collected glories upon him, perhaps (alas! is not the hope presumptuous?)—perhaps (despair almost arrests my pen)—perhaps we may equal in erudition the *profoundly learned* Dr. M. At present we lay claim to sufficient learning and talents to defend the Episcopal Church against any adversary. Even the sneers, and frowns, and haughty airs of the Editor of the Christian's Magazine, we can summon resolution to smile at, and to disregard.

Is it then come to this? Is the cause of Presbytery to rest on "mere *names* which are of little real value?"* What is the Episcopal argument from scripture? Episcopalians contend that from the first there have been three grades of the ministry. Christ, the Apostles, and the seventy; then the Apostles, Bishops Presbyters or Elders, and Deacons; then Timothy and Titus, and others who succeeded the Apostles in the powers of ordination and government, Presbyters and Elders called also Bishops, and Deacons. Your assertion is manifestly incorrect, that there are in scripture only two grades. But how does the Episcopalian prove that there was a grade of the ministry superior to those called in scrip-

* Mr. M'Leod's Ecclesiastical Catechism, p. 30.

ture Presbyters or Bishops? By a simple and unerring rule. The *powers* vested in them and their acts of *jurisdiction*. Timothy and Titus had the powers of ordaining and governing the clergy vested in them; they had jurisdiction over Presbyters. There is no proof that the Presbyters possessed these powers or exercised this jurisdiction. To a man who contends "for the *thing* and not for the name,"* "who has no turn to serve,"† one would think that when we prove that certain ministers, by apostolic institution, possessed powers and exercised a jurisdiction which we have no proof that another set of ministers possessed or exercised, there is the most satisfactory evidence that these last have no claim to these powers.

To this first grade of the ministry, ecclesiastical usage has applied the title of Bishops. And hence it is contended by the opponents of Episcopacy, that the grade of ministers now called Bishops, cannot be superior to Presbyters, because in scripture these titles are applied to the same office! Episcopalians prove that there is a grade of ministers superior to those styled Presbyters or Bishops in scripture; and because to this superior grade a title was afterwards applied usually given in scripture to the second grade, it is contended by the opponents of Episcopacy, that these two grades are the same! Are not Episcopalians justifiable in styling this "miserable sophistry?" Do you not admit the justice of this appellation, when, after a laboured argument of several pages to prove the identity of those *now* called Bishops and Presbyters, from the indiscriminate application of these titles in scripture, you acknowledge that "if the Episcopalian establish his claim" of a superior grade "by scriptural *facts*," "the choice between victory or defeat" "in the contest about scriptural titles," "would not be worth a straw to either party?"‡ You applied your ingenuity and your learning through several pages, to prove that there could not be a

* Mr. M'Leod's Ecclesiastical Catechism, p. 18.
† Christian's Magazine, p. 191. ‡ p. 106, 107.

superior grade to Presbyters, because the title bestowed by Episcopalians on this grade is used in scripture indiscriminately with Presbyter. And yet you concede, "abstractly considered, there is no inconsistency between our doctrine of the identity of Bishops and Presbyters, and the Episcopal doctrine of a superior grade."* What is this then but acknowledging that you have been insulting the understandings of your readers, by endeavouring to blind them with "miserable sophistry?" You demolish by the above concession your own superstructure. You give up as untenable an argument which you tell us "men of singular learning, candour, penetration, and force of mind, have considered as altogether unanswerable."† And so have men of singular learning, candour, penetration and force of mind, considered as altogether unanswerable the arguments in favour of transubstantiation and the supremacy of the Pope.

I might scorn, therefore, to notice any further an argument which you have yourself laid in the dust. But "some amusement may be derived from remarking" how just and lucid are your views of it.

The Layman and his colleagues never contended that the titles *Bishop* and *Presbyter* were not generally applied in scripture to denote the second grade of the ministry. But they contended, what is plain as "the sun shining in his strength," that these words, whether considered as terms denoting authority, or titles affixed to particular officers, were capable of general application, and were not *inseparably* and *immutably* fixed to any particular officer; and that hence we could not infer, merely from their *application*, that the persons to whom they were applied, either at the same period or at different periods, were the *same officers*. For example —The title *Bishop*, as denoting an *overseer*, is applied both as a term of authority and a title of office to "Jesus Christ the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls," denoting his *authority* and *office* as spiritual *overseer* of the souls of his people.

* Christian's Magazine, No. II. p. 207. † p. 189.

But it would surely be madness to conclude that Jesus Christ was on a level with *overseers*, or Bishops of churches. In like manner the term Presbyter, in its general and official signification as a *ruler*, may be and has been applied to the Apostles, who were divinely inspired governors of the church, as well as to inferior officers. The term Deacon, in its signification as a *minister*, may be and has been applied to Jesus Christ and his Apostles as well as to inferior ministers.

"But when have these terms a *particular* and when a *general* signification?" They have a *particular* signification when they are applied to officers vested with peculiar and distinct powers and jurisdiction. The distinction of officers is to be known with certainty not from their names, but from their *powers* and *jurisdiction*. This was the position of the Layman and his associates; a position which all your ingenuity cannot subvert. It is not true, as you assert, that objects are correctly distinguished from one another by their *names*. The *titles* of officers alone will not accurately distinguish them. The distinction can be assertained only by determining their *powers* and *jurisdiction*. For example—A man may hear the people at New-Haven and Princeton talk of *the President*. But from the name, from the official *title* only, he would be at a loss to know whether they meant a civil or a literary officer. Nor would his doubt be wholly removed (were he a stranger in our country) if they should name President JEFFERSON, President DWIGHT, or President SMITH; for the official *titles* only would not determine the precise nature of their offices. He must be informed of their respective *powers* and *jurisdiction* before he can understand precisely the difference between them.

Let us take one of your own words. "*The Assembly*," according to you, is an *official title*. But the title alone, applied to any body of people, would not accurately distinguish them. *The Assembly* may be applied to a collection of persons at Albany, from the different counties; to a collection of Presbyterian ministers at Philadelphia, from the different

Presbyteries; or to a collection of people at any place for the purpose of enjoying the amusement of dancing. Now, had a stranger to your sacred character been told last winter that Dr. MASON had gone to "the ASSEMBLY," he might as well have concluded, from the *name alone*, that you had gone to "the Assembly" in the city of New-York, to partake of the amusement of dancing, as that you had gone to "the Assembly" at Albany, to obtain an act of incorporation for the Associate-Reformed Church. I make this remark on one of your examples, merely for the sake of illustration. The application of the official term, "the Assembly," to different collections of people, would not enable a stranger to form an accurate idea of their nature. This he cannot know until he is informed of their respective *powers*, *jurisdiction* and *objects*.

In like manner "the Bishop" is an *official title;* but when applied to ministers it will not designate them accurately and precisely. For example—We have Dr. MOORE, *the Bishop*, and Dr. MASON, *the Bishop*. Now, a stranger would conclude you were both the same officer. But I presume you would be soon anxious to satisfy him that your *powers* and *jurisdiction* were very different; that you were the scriptural Bishop of a single *congregation*, and he was the "unscriptural and anti-Christian" Bishop of a *diocese*. In like manner, the titles *Elders* and *Deacons*, applied to officers in the Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches, would not accurately designate them. For in the *Episcopal* Church an *Elder* has the ministry of the word and sacraments; but in the *Presbyterian* he is only a help to the minister in the administration of discipline. A *Deacon* in the Episcopal Church, like the Deacons in scripture, both preaches and baptizes;* but in the Presbyterian his *sole* business is to look after the poor. "The sum of the whole is," that we are to ascertain the distinction and

* Philip the Deacon, converted and baptized the Samaritans (Acts viii. 6.) And the Deacons were set apart to this office by a solemn ordination.

precise nature of officers not by their official titles, but by their *powers* and *jurisdiction*. Applying this plain proposition to the officers of the Christian church, we find that there is one grade of officers, in which were *Timothy* and *Titus*, who possessed the powers of ordination; and another grade of officers who did not possess these powers, but only the ministry of the word and sacraments. We concede that this second grade are commonly called Elders, Presbyters, or Bishops:* yet we contend that from comparing their *powers* and *jurisdiction* with those of Timothy and Titus, it is apparent that they were of an inferior grade, and did not possess the powers of ordaining and governing church officers. We contend that the title *Bishop*, applied to them as *overseers* of their respective flocks, is not so incommunicably and inseparably fixed to them, as that it cannot be applied, as it has been, by ecclesiastical usage, to the superior grade who succeeded *Timothy* and *Titus* in their powers of ordination and government, and who are *overseers* over the clergy and congregations. As Mr. M'Leod very justly observes, "*names* are of little real value." "It is for the *thing*, not the name we contend." We prove from their respective *powers* and *jurisdiction*, that there is a grade of ministers with the powers of ordination and government superior to ordinary ministers of the word. To contend that, because a *title* of general application is transferred from the second grade, to whom it is usually applied in scripture, to the first, they must originally have been the same office, is too absurd, one would think, to be advanced by any man of common sense. Suppose it

* On this point you avail yourself very liberally of Dr. Hammond's singular opinions. Dr. H. was confessedly a very *learned* and distinguished divine. But great learning is no security against hypothetical systems. Dr. H. it is well known, maintained some singular opinions on other subjects besides that of Episcopacy. No cause or system is responsible for every defence which its advocates may choose to set up. Remember, you chide (and astonishing too that you should *gently* chide) Mr. M'Leod *for not selecting his proofs from scripture with equal care.**

* Christian's Magazine, No. I. p. 108, 109.

should be found expedient, without altering the powers of those now called Bishops in Episcopal Churches, to alter their titles, and to call them *superintendents*, and to give the term Bishop to the second order as *overseers* of congregations; would any man in his senses contend, contrary to fact, that because Presbyters are called Bishops, they originally possessed the powers which those formerly called Bishops in Episcopal Churches possessed? This possible case proves the fallacy of your position, that "change of *names* presupposes change of *things*."* This is not necessarily true in theory; nor is it so in fact. Various circumstances may render expedient a change of names while the things themselves remain the same. There are now three grades of ministers in Episcopal churches, with appropriate powers, called Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons. Might not the church change the *names* of these officers without in any degree changing their powers?

"Change of *names* presupposes change of things!" This is not true *in fact*. The original name of the second order of the ministry was *Elder* or *Presbyter*. Yet these names in the Church of England, and in the Episcopal Church in America, have grown into disuse, and the official title of those orignally called Presbyter is now *Priests*. Here is a change of name without any change in the office.† As the names of things are often changed while the things remain the same, so, on the contrary, *things* are often changed and not their names. Of this one single familiar instance shall suffice. The supreme legislative assembly of the United States bears now the same name, *Congress*, which it did before the adoption of the present constitution. And yet under the old confederation, the *Congress* consisted of but

* Christian's Magazine, No. II. p. 211.

† A familiar instance of *change* of names without change of things may be given which will strike every person. The names of certain streets in the city of New-York have been changed since the Revolution, while the streets have remained the same.

one house of delegates elected by the legislatures of the States, and possessed but few general powers. Under the new form of government, the Congress consists of two houses, one of them chosen by the legislatures and the other by the people of the several States, and their powers are much enlarged. Here was a material change of the *thing* and no change of the name. Before you indulge in positive and dogmatic assertions, it will be well for you to reflect whether they are supported by facts. Your laboured reasoning about names is almost entirely fallacious.

There was an adequate reason for the change of the titles of the first grade of the ministry. They succeeded the *Apostles* in their *ordinary* apostolic powers of ordination and government; but in order that the name Apostles might be applied by way of pre-eminence to the twelve, it was natural and proper that the first grade of the ministry should assume some other title. And the title Bishop is applied with as much propriety to them who are overseers of the clergy and congregations, as to Presbyters who were overseers of a smaller portion of the flock.

Yes, sir, you grant all that Episcopalians can wish when you concede that, "there is no inconsistency between the doctrine of the identity of Bishops and Presbyters, and the Episcopal doctrine of a superior grade." And how are we to determine whether there is a superior grade to those called Bishops and Presbyters in scripture? Surely, by ascertaining that there is a distinct grade of officers with superior *powers* and *jurisdiction*. But you assert that there could be no such superior grade, because there is no official title determinately applied to them in scripture. Strange indeed! We prove that Timothy and Titus and others possessed the power of ordination, which we do not find the other ministers possessed, and the power of jurisdiction over the ministers and people; and yet we are not to believe these palpable *facts* because we do not find any names determinately applied to these officers. What! could not the

Apostles institute officers and leave their title to be fixed by ecclesiastical usage? It is not improbable (as many of the Fathers assert, your favourite JEROME among the number) that this first grade of the ministry were called *Apostles*, as succeeding to the *ordinary* powers of the apostolic office. As the chosen companions of our Lord, and witnesses of his resurrection, the Apostles were *extraordinary* officers, and could have no successors. But in their ordinary powers of *ordination* and *government* (powers necessary in all periods of the church,) they were to have successors even, according to the promise of their Lord, "to the end of the world." Your sneers at *Cyprian* for considering *Epaphroditus* as an *Apostle*, might have been spared, had you considered that your favourite and learned JEROME considers him as one of the superior grade of ministers, afterwards called Bishops, and founds his assertion on the text to the Philippians, in which he is called their "Apostle."*

It is not necessary, however, for the advocates of Episcopacy to prove that the title *Apostles* was given to the first grade of the ministry. For your argument that there can be no grade of ministers in scripture answering to those now called Bishops in Episcopal Churches, because there is no title annexed to them in scripture, like many of your other arguments, may be made to recoil upon yourself. You assert "that Presbyterian government is the true and only one which the Lord Jesus Christ has prescribed in his word."† "Congregational Assemblies or Sessions," and "particular and general Synods," are constituent parts of Presbyterian government, and of course prescribed by God in his word. But on searching the scriptures we cannot find in them any such titles of ecclesiastical bodies as "Sessions," or "general or particular Synods;" and indeed

* Jerome observes (Com. Gal. i. 19,) "By degrees, in process of time, others were ordained Apostles by those whom our Lord had chosen, as that passage to the Philippians shows, "I supposed it necessary to send you Epaphroditus your Apostle."

† Constitution of the Associate-Reformed Church, p. 475.

there are no titles whatever annexed to ecclesiastical bodies supposed to correspond with the *Sessions* and *Synods* of Presbyterians. Of course, according to your argument, there can be no such bodies of divine institution—and, therefore, the constituent parts of Presbyterian government must be of human invention. Really, sir, (to use the language you apply to us) I am afraid "drowsiness" is not peculiar to the advocates of Episcopacy, and that even the vigorous Dr. MASON sometimes claims "the indulgence of a nap."

But further, sir, that fundamental doctrine of the Christian church, the existence of three persons in one God, has no name applied to it in scripture. Therefore, according to your reasoning, it cannot be revealed in the word of God; it is of human invention. Here you side with "those great luminaries of wisdom, Dr. PRIESTLEY and his compeers." They urge exactly the same reasoning against the doctrine of the Trinity that you do against Bishops. That such a fundamental doctrine should have no name affixed to it in scripture (they contend,) "so far surpasses all the powers of belief, that the proof of its existence is almost if not altogether impossible." No, sir, we prove the doctrine of the Trinity in the same way that we prove the existence of the first grade of the ministry. From the *acts* and the *powers* of the *Son* and the *Holy Ghost*, we are justifiable in concluding that they are equal with God the Father; and to this doctrine of three persons in one God, we give the name of *Trinity*, which is no where found in scripture. From the *acts* and *powers* of Timothy and Titus we conclude, that they are a superior grade of the ministry, and to them and their successors we give the title of Bishops.

The truth is—the distinction and the nature of scripture officers are to be known certainly from their *powers* and *jurisdiction*, and not from their *names* merely. And for these obvious reasons, which Mr. M'LEOD has assigned with equal justice and candour: "Names are of little real value." "It is for the thing, not the name we should contend."

"Truly, sir, should you go on as you have commenced, I do not think that the Christian's Magazine is "likely to fill the" advocates of Episcopacy "with any very great alarm."

---

## LETTER XVI.

SIR,

To disprove bold charges requires many more words than to make them. On the score of conciseness, therefore, you certainly have the advantage over me. It has been my object minutely to expose the injustice of your charges, and to exhibit a general view of the principles of Episcopacy, and of the arguments in favour of it.

The obnoxious colours in which you represented my principles in the first number of the Christian's Magazine, justify me in contrasting your religious system with my own, that the public may judge whether your principles or mine most merit the charge of being "arrogant" and of "deep-toned horror."

You observe, "Whether a man shall go to heaven or to hell, will be decided by another inquiry than whether he was an Episcopalian, a Presbyterian, or an Independent." On your principles the inquiry is fixed to this point, "whether he is one of the elect." On your principles the decree of God sends some to heaven, and others to hell. Take the words of the Westminster Confession of Faith: "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death;"* and this predestination, having no respect to their use or abuse of the means of grace, is absolute and unconditional. On your principles *guilt* is brought on all mankind, not merely (as anti-Calvinists main-

* Confession of Faith, chap. iii. sect. 3. The Westminster Confession of Faith is the standard of doctrine of all the Presbyterian Churches.

tain) by those sins which, through divine grace, it was in their power to avoid, but for a sin which they never committed, for the sin of their forefather Adam; and for this sin they are doomed to everlasting woe.* From this everlasting woe none are, none can be saved, but a certain portion, selected in a sovereign manner, from this condemned mass of mankind. While all mankind in their fallen state must have been the objects of the compassion of the Father of mercies, yet (according to your system) for a select number only did he provide a Saviour. For them, and for them only, did his eternal Son sojourn in the veil of flesh, travail in agony of spirit, and pour out his soul unto death. They only in God's sovereign time are seized by irresistible grace, justified, sanctified, saved, without the possibility by any misconduct of forfeiting a salvation which a divine decree ensures to them, to which irresistible grace infallibly conducts them.† The "hinging point" on which their salvation turns, is the everlasting decree of God.

As for the rest of mankind, the "many" who go "the broad way to destruction," according to the Calvinistic system, they remain for ever under the curse of Adam's sin. Equally helpless, equally related, as the creatures of his hand, to the Father of mercies, with the elect objects of his favour, yet on them the Redeemer never cast one look of compassion; for them he never shed one drop of blood; to them he never dispenses one spark of effectual grace.‡ And

* Confession of Faith, chap. vi. sect. 6.

† "As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, foreordained all the means thereunto." Confession of Faith, chap. iii. 6. "Those whom God hath accepted in his beloved, effectually called and sanctified by his spirit, can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace; but shall certainly persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved." Confession of Faith, chap. xvii. 1.

‡ "Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only." Confession of Faith, chap. iii. 6.

yet in this state, without a Redeemer, without any interest in his atonement, any participation of his grace, of course without the possibility of being saved, they are to receive the offers of salvation! Mockery of their wretchedness!! According to this system, thousands, millions, myriads of hapless mortals will clank the chains of everlasting torment, will roll in the fires that never will be quenched, and will be gnawed by the worm that never dies, for the sin of another, for the sin of Adam; from the imputed guilt of which, left as they were by the decree of God, without the atonement, without the grace of the Redeemer, they possessed no means of escape.* According to this system, the sinner dies, the anticipated torments of hell racking his soul, and its groans bursting from his lips, because God, for the "manifestation of his glory," shut him out, by a decree of reprobation, from the number of the elect.† According to your sys-

* "The guilt of this sin" (the sin of Adam) "was imputed—to all their posterity." Confession of Faith, chap. vi. 3 and 6. From this guilt of Adam's sin, from this *eternal death* to which all mankind are doomed in consequence of it, "none are redeemed by Christ, &c. but the elect only." Confession of Faith, chap. iii. 6. For "the rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to *pass by*, and to ordain them to *dishonour and wrath* for their *sin*, to the praise of his glorious justice." Confession of Faith, chap. iii. 7. "Every sin, both *original* and actual, doth in its mere nature bring *guilt* upon the sinner, whereby he is bound over to the wrath of God, &c. and so made subject to death with all miseries, spiritual, temporal, and *eternal*." Confession of Faith, chap. vi. 6. For the sin of Adam then those whom God "passed by" were ordained to dishonour and wrath.

† "Quos Deus *preterit*, reprobat"—says CALVIN. Institutes, lib. iii. xxiii. 1. "Whom God *passes by*, he *reprobates*." And CALVIN further says, "But those whom he appointeth to damnation, to them we say by his just and irreprehensible, but also incomprehensible judgment, the entry of life is blocked up." Calvin's Institutes, lib. iii. xxi. 7. CALVIN styles the decree of God, by which "the fall of Adam did wrap up in eternal death so many nations with their *children* being *infants*, without remedy"—*horribile decretum*, *horrible* decree. And well he might. Any school-boy who can turn over his dictionary knows that *horribilis*

tem, "*elect* infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved;"* and as "none are saved but the elect only,"† those infants dying in infancy who are not of the elect, are not saved.‡ Alas! then, even those endearing infants, blessed by our Lord himself as the emblems of innocence, are perhaps destined to be torn from the cherishing bosom of their mothers, and to be sent to people the regions of the damned! Ye mothers! does not the bare possibility that the engaging prattlings of your lovely babes, may tomorrow be changed into the groans of fiends, plant a dagger in your bosoms more agonizing than the vengeful dart that drinks up the current of life!—My heart shudders! Righteous God! who ever delightest in mercy! shall man transform thee into a demon like an insatiate Moloch, delighting in the perdition of the creatures of thy hand? No, thou holy, thou just, thou merciful Parent of the universe! the system

has the signification of *awful* as well as *horrible*, and as I understand that it is your intention to take me to task for translating it *horrible*, and to overwhelm your readers with a flood of learning to prove that this is not its most common acceptation, I think it proper to state that TOPLADY has anticipated you on this subject. He adduces many examples in which *horribilis* is used in the acceptation, *awful*, *mysterious*, *wonderful*, and contends that CALVIN used it in this acceptation in the sentence referred to. I take the liberty, however, of contending, that the plain, fair construction of the whole passage implies, that CALVIN deemed this decree *horrible*, abhorrent to the reason and feelings of man: but this is very different from believing that the decree was so *in itself*, to the *divine mind*. However horrible the decree might appear to human reason, CALVIN, believing it to be from God, would also believe it to be just and good. In a translation of the Institutes of CALVIN, made and published under the sanction of Presbyterian divines at Glasgow (1762,) I find the words *horribile decretum*, translated *terrible decree*. I have no objection that my translation should be so corrected, and instead of calling this decree a *horrible decree*, let it be styled a TERRIBLE DECREE!

* Confession of Faith, chap. x. 3. † Chap. iii. 6.

‡ Had it been the intention of the Confession of Faith to include all infants dying in infancy among the number of the elect, the section would have run in some such form as the following: "All infants dying in infancy, as they are of the number of the elect, are regenerated and saved," &c.

which clothes thee with these terrors is disclaimed by reason and by thy holy word.

I am no more compelled to account for many pious and learned persons having embraced this system, among whom, it is not to be denied, have ranked some eminent divines of the Church of England, than to account for many pious and learned persons having embraced the doctrine of transubstantiation. Many doctrines may be, must be incomprehensible: but the divine Author of our senses and our reason will never require us to believe what palpably contradicts them. I pretend not to judge for others, or to measure, by my own, the capacity of their minds. But for myself I must confess, that I could more readily be brought to believe that a being of infinite power could change bread and wine into the body and blood of a man, and their properties and sensible qualities still remain the same; than that an infinitely just and merciful God would bring men into existence, and without any regard to the use or abuse of the talents and means of grace entrusted to them, doom them by an absolute decree to everlasting perdition. With respect to the moral aspect of these doctrines on the attributes and character of God, there is no kind of comparison. Transubstantiation violates none of the moral attributes of the Deity; absolute predestination strips him of every attribute that can render him the object of admiration and love.

View now, sir, the system of religious truth embraced by those whom you denounce for holding positions of "deep-toned horror." The sin of Adam has entailed on his posterity a corrupt and depraved nature. Though this corruption or original sin in "every man," "deserves God's wrath and damnation,"* yet none will be condemned for it but those who refuse the means of redemption from its dominion, and from the guilt of their actual sins. For the adorable Son of God has made an atonement for the "sins of the world," "has tasted death for *every* man."† "He came to

* Art. IX. of the Church. † Heb. ii. 9.

be a lamb without spot, who should take away the *sins of the world.*"* "He made a full, perfect, and sufficient oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."† Thus all men, redeemed by Christ, are placed in a state of salvation, in which their eternal destiny will depend only on "the things done in the body." The grace of God alone begins, carries on, and perfects the spiritual life. God's *preventing* "grace is given to every man to profit withal"‡—given to every man in sufficient degree to enable him to work out his salvation. But the scripture has told us that we may "resist this grace," "do despite unto it," "quench it," and provoke God to take "it from us." While, therefore, we believe that God worketh in us by his spirit, that "we may have a good will, and worketh with us when we have that good will,"§ we are also to "work out our own salvation with fear and trembling." The condemnation, therefore, of the impenitent will be, that they "resisted and grieved God's holy spirit," that they "would not come unto him and receive life."‖ Where the name of Christ is not proclaimed, his atonement extends, his grace operates, and leads to his everlasting favour those "who having not the law, yet do the things contained in the law." Where the glad tidings of salvation are proclaimed, men must be

* Art. XV. of the Church. † Communion Service.

‡ 1 Cor. xii. 7. § Art. X. of the Church.

‖ From the above view it appears that the Articles of the Church do not maintain the peculiarities of Calvinism; that they do not maintain that *all but the elect will be damned for Adam's sin, as well as their actual sins;* and that *Christ died for the elect only.* They do not maintain that the *grace of God works irresistibly*, that *man is passive in conversion*, and that the *elect can never finally fall away from grace.* The article concerning predestination merely decrees the determination of God to bring "those whom he hath chosen in Christ" "to everlasting salvation." But it does not assert, as the Calvinistic Confessions of Faith do, that this choice was made without any "foreknowledge" of the use which they would make of the means of grace and salvation. It is also entirely silent on that important article of Calvinism, that God ***passed by the rest of mankind, and ordained them to dishonour and wrath.***

united to him by a lively and holy faith. The blessings of his salvation are visibly sealed to believers by the ordinances of the church; and these ordinances are to be administered only by those who are "called of God, as was Aaron," by a valid external commission. On these principles all are saved through the power of the Redeemer's blood, who, through his grace, seek to know and to do the will of their heavenly Master. Can a system more charitable be required of me? Let the public judge. Let candour and justice look on your system and on mine, and pronounce sentence. Let them say which of us holds positions of "deep-toned horror."

It may be said that there is the same difficulty in the anti-Calvinistic as in the Calvinistic system: that, on the anti-Calvinistic system, as the Almighty *foresaw* that numbers of the human race would finally perish, with this foreknowledge creating them, he decreed their perdition. But, on the Calvinistic scheme, he decreed this perdition, not because he *foresaw* they would *incur* or *deserve* it; he decreed it without any respect to his foreknowledge of the use which they would make of the means of grace.* He provided for them no Saviour, no atonement, no effectual grace, without which they could not be saved. On the anti-Calvinistic scheme, he provided for them a Saviour, an atonement, and the influences of divine grace; and, therefore, the ground of their perdition is, that with the most powerful motives and adequate means they freely "chose darkness rather than light." On the Calvinistic system, as no atonement was made for them, and no grace given to them, they could not be saved. It is the *decree*, and consequently the will of God, that they should not be saved. On the anti-Calvinistic system, as both an atonement and means of grace were provided, they would have been saved if they had not resisted this grace and contemned this atonement. The difficulties in the anti-Calvinistic system arise only when we attempt to investi-

* Confession of Faith, chap. iii. 5.

gate the incomprehensible subject of the divine foreknowledge. It is of importance to observe, that they do not arise from the system itself. Every thing in it is luminous, lovely and benevolent—the Deity providing a Saviour for all his fallen creatures, conferring his grace on them all, so that if they perish, it is because they "would not come unto him, that they might have life." But the difficulties in the Calvinistic scheme are essential to the system itself. For in it we find no Saviour, no mercy, no grace provided for any but the *elect*, absolutely, unconditionally elected.

The temple of Calvinism, dark and dismaying, rears its gloomy spire amidst perpetual clouds, rolling in blackness. From their lowering bosom burst forth, with frightful glare, the awful peals—UNCONDITIONAL SALVATION TO THE ELECT—PERDITION TO THE REST OF MANKIND. From its dreary courts, traversed with fearful step by crowds of hapless sinners, is excluded the light of hope. Only the elect are admitted into its *holy place;* where reigns, not the Father of mercies, the *God of love*, whose throne is goodness, whose sceptre is mercy; but an ARBITRARY SOVEREIGN, whose throne is power, whose sceptre is vengeance, and the arm that wields it, caprice. For while a few select favourites are exalted to his favour, the great mass of mortals, "not more sinful than they," are consigned to perdition. Ah! how appalling the "confused noises" that burst from this frightful dome. The proud triumphs of the favourites of a resistless sovereign, who are made, in spite of themselves, the subjects of his favour, mingling with the groans of the *reprobate*—groans embittered by the reflection that the Saviour died not for them, that the grace "without which they could do nothing" was never extended to them—O my soul, into the secret of this council come thou not; unto this assembly, mine honour, be not thou united.

I state the views under which Calvinism appears to my mind. I mean no injurious reflections on those who maintain its peculiar doctrines, and who of course do not view

them in the same light with myself. Many persons who profess the peculiar tenets of Calvinism, are my particular friends; endeared to me by their piety, their worth and talents. But of these doctrines, by whomsoever maintained, I must say —LET THEM PERISH. In my humble judgment, they are hostile to the spirit of the Christian system, to reason, and every amiable feeling of the heart. They cherish the prejudices of the infidel against a religion which contains doctrines so gloomy and terrible. They often sweep with the tempests of despair, the bosom of the timid and humble Christian; while they buoy up with presumptuous triumph many who, above all others, ought not to "be high-minded, but to fear." Do they ascribe all the work of man's salvation to God? "Not unto us, O Lord, but unto thy name be the praise," should indeed be the language of every Christian before his Creator and Saviour, from whom alone he derives his being, the means of grace and forgiveness, and the hope of glory. But God cannot be honoured by the service of those whom, by an irresistible decree, he compels into his service. Man, through divine grace, is free to accept or to reject the mercy offered to him. And, therefore, he is commanded to "work out his salvation, for it is God who worketh in him to will and to do." By a *voluntary* service through grace, he glorifies God; and not by a service to which a *sovereign* decree devotes him, to which irresistible grace impels him.

An imperious principle of self-defence has called forth these letters. I had hoped to have been permitted to enforce on Episcopalians the principles of their church without provoking the censure of others; while I left to them the same right which I claimed to myself. In confining originally my remarks on Episcopal principles to books addressed to Episcopalians and calculated for their use, I surely observed the dictates of prudence and decorum. The errors which you and others conceived to be contained in these books, might have been sufficiently counteracted by private conversation,

by instructions from the pulpit, by manuals of faith and order published for your own people, of which, if there had been no personal reference to me, I should not have felt myself compelled to take notice. But another course has been chosen. My principles have been attacked in the newspapers. My name has been bandied on the tongues of the thoughtless, in disgraceful alliance with *fool* and *bigot*. And to sink me yet lower in the pit of infamy, you represent me as holding principles which consign to perdition the brightest saints that ever adorned the church on earth, or will chant forth the hallelujahs of heaven. I am denounced, condemned, and stretched on the rack of proud and overbearing criticism, in a periodical publication, from the privilege of defending myself in which I am proscribed; for the circulation of which unexampled pains have been taken; and which hundreds will peruse who will never see my vindication, or who will turn with horror from any production of one who makes the only alternative "Episcopacy or Perdition."

But all this and more will not intimidate me from defending the principles of my church. I mean not indeed to disdain the opinion of the world. I boast not of that insensibility which never glows at the soothing voice of merited commendation, nor sinks under the frown of just censure. Precious to my soul have ever been the friendship and the love of the virtuous. I view the chief happiness of this world as consisting, next to the joys of religion, in the delightful intercourse of friendship and affection. My feelings are particularly wounded by your system of denunciation, because it tends to close against me the bosoms of many in whose hearts I should wish to find a place. But there are principles which I should ever desire to be paramount in my soul—the *love of truth*, the *love of duty*. God grant that I may ever feel that sacred independence which will never sacrifice these principles to considerations of personal interest or feeling. I strike out into no new paths. I advocate no new principles. I arrogate no new discoveries. The GOOD OLD PATH

in which the Fathers of the primitive church followed their blessed Master to martyrdom and glory; in which the venerable Fathers of the Church of England found rest to their souls—is the path in which I would wish to lead, to a "rest eternal in the heavens," myself and those that hear me.

In the remarks which I have addressed to you, I have considered you only as the *Editor* of the Christian's Magazine. And in this character only, my principles compel me to be hostile to you. I should despise myself did I not cherish the sentiments of sincere respect for a Scholar of distinguished attainments, for a Divine eloquent, zealous and exemplary in the discharge of his high functions. Contest like that to which the Christian's Magazine calls me, suits not the temper of my soul. I think it should have been "made of sterner stuff." Were I not supported by that consciousness of rectitude; above all, by that sacred zeal for the cause of truth, which case the soul as with adamant, I would lament the hour, when, in the innocence of my heart, I ushered to the world a performance, concerning which I only indulged the humble hope that it might tend to revive in some degree, among Episcopalians, the spirit of primitive piety, truth and order. That performance, though addressed to Episcopalians, and designed for them, has excited in others an ire which no explanations can moderate or appease. It has excited an ire which repels with disdain, that charity which embraces in her wide-extended arms the sincere inquirers after truth, by whatever name distinguished. Until that performance brought me forward, a mark for the arrows of the vengeful polemic, I had passed the "noiseless tenour of my way." The seats of a college, from which I had but a few years emerged, had cherished in my soul a love of science, an ardent thirst for truth, but had not furnished me with that breast-plate of apathy which defends the bosom from those keen darts of scorn, invective and denunciation, that are hurled on the combatant in the field of controversy. The bosom of friendship on which I had there reclined;

"the sweet converse of friends," among whom it is my pride to number the writers who, under the signatures of a Layman and Cyprian,* defended the Episcopal cause, among whom it is my pride to rank one who bears a Christian name different from my own,† had not prepared me to smother that sensibility which, leaping over every dissonance of opinion, fixes with ardour and tenderness on the virtuous and kindred spirit. But my feelings have beguiled me into a strain which some persons may deem idle, at which others will perhaps raise the sneer of scorn. I stop. It were folly, as the conscientious advocate for truth, it were disgraceful to mourn, that her holy interests have urged me into the field of controversy. My banner is, EVANGELICAL TRUTH, APOSTOLIC ORDER. Firm and undaunted, though the spear raised against me be tremendous as that with which Goliath of Gath threatened to crush the stripling David, I must summon to the defence of my sacred cause whatever powers nature (alas! as yet indeed too little cultivated by the laborious hand of study) has bestowed upon me; whatever ardour, whatever zeal nature has enkindled in my bosom. It were vain to rest here. I must arm myself by imploring the grace of him whose glory it is to make often the humblest instrument the victorious champion of his truth.

*Pro ecclesiâ Dei, pro ecclesiâ Dei.* Like the venerable prelate‡ who chose these words as the standard of his wishes, his duties, his labours, his dying prayers, every minister should be supremely devoted to the CHURCH OF GOD. When you, Sir, survey the heresies that deform the fair face of the Zion of the Lord, the schisms that distract and rend asunder her members, I feel confident that from the heart you will join with me in the following prayer of one§ who, having sung in the church on earth its sweetest strains, now rests in hope of chaunting forth from the highest

* T. Y. H. Esq. and the Rev. Mr. B.
† Rev. Dr. K.
‡ Archbishop WHITGIFT.
§ Bishop HORNE.

seats of the church triumphant "the praises of God and of the Lamb."

"Come, O thou divine Spirit of peace and love, who didst reside in the soul of the holy Jesus, descend into his mystical body; and fill us, who compose it, with all his heavenly tempers; put an end to heresies, heal all schisms, cause bitter contention to cease, abolish every enmity, and make us to be of one mind in thy holy city; that so, 'peace being within her walls,' her citizens may give themselves to every profitable employment, and 'plenteousness' of grace, wisdom and truth, as well as of earthly blessings, may be in all her 'palaces.' Thus will she become a lively portrait of that place which is prepared for them that love one another, where, with one heart, and one voice, they shall ascribe 'salvation and glory to God and to the Lamb."

In offering this prayer, I trust we can meet at the footstool of the throne of grace; and in the spirit of peace and amity which it inspires, I subscribe myself

Your obedient servant,

J. H. HOBART.

*June*, 1807.

DATE DUE

APR 24 '91
MAY 16 '91
JAN - 1 '92
DEC 20 1994
OCT 16 '97
JUN 04

GAYLORD
PRINTED IN U.S.A.

19928

270J
P182.5

AUTHOR Palmer, William

TITLE Ecclesiastical History
& Bishop Hobarts Apology

| DATE LOANED | BORROWER'S NAME | DATE RETURNED |
| --- | --- | --- |
| | | |

270 J
P182.5

19928

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
00027469